Class BX8

Book .C45

PRESENTED BY

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE GOSPEL

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE GOSPEL

BY

BISHOP INGHAM
DR. H. WACE
(Dean of Canterbury)
DR. CARNEGIE SIMPSON
DR. R. C. GILLIE
REV. THOMAS YATES
REV. E. L. LANGSTON
SIR ANDREW WINGATE
DR. NORMAN MACLEAN
DR. DOUGLAS ADAM
THE LATE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD
REV. I. SIVITER
REV. F. C. SPURR
DR. E. A. BURROUGHS
(Dean of Bristol)
BISHOP WELLDON
(Dean of Durham)
CANON H. A. WILSON
REV. W. Y. FULLERTON
REV. THE HON. W. TALBOT RICE
THE BISHOP OF BRADFORD
DR. J. H. RITSON
THE BISHOP OF UGANDA

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

c1923

BX8
.C45

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Richard Clay & Sons, Limited,
Printers, Bungay, Suffolk.

GIFT
PUBLISHER
DEC 11 '24

THIS volume is composed of addresses given and papers read at the United Evangelical Congress held at the Church House, Westminster, in June 1923. The general subject was "Christian Unity and The Gospel." The Congress was promoted by the World's Evangelical Alliance (British Organisation), and adds another to the series of notable Conferences it has convened during the past seventy-seven years. The Alliance unites Evangelical and Protestant Churches and Christians of all lands who are content to recognise differences of outlook and conviction as of secondary importance so long as men are loyal to the Gospel of Salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. They believe in the simplicity as well as in the supremacy of the Gospel, and affirm that the Bible is "Divinely Inspired, Authoritative, and Sufficient."

Minor differences as well as central agreement will therefore be found in this volume. The Editors have not considered it their duty to harmonise the various utterances of the different speakers. Some addresses are given

as they were spoken, others were prepared to be read rather than to be heard. The contents vary as their form does. The Editors are, however, confident that readers will be impressed by the large measure of agreement which becomes unmistakable whenever our Lord and the Gospel of His Grace are in the forefront.

This harmony is more remarkable when it is observed from how wide an area the speakers were drawn. The Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Evangelical Free Churches of England were all represented. Distinguished laymen, as well as Clergy and Ministers, professors as well as preachers, took part, and a notable Missionary Bishop gave the concluding address of the Congress.

The Congress was remarkable as a demonstration of Christian Unity, and this volume is offered to the public as an interpretation of true Unity, and of the Gospel of Christ on which it depends.

THE GOSPEL: HISTORIC AND REVEALED

PAGE

I. The Raison d'Être of the Congress . 9
By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Ingham, D.D.

II. Its Birth in History 16
By the Very Rev. Dr. H. Wace
(Dean of Canterbury)

III. Its Revelation in Christ . . . 36
By the Rev. Dr. Carnegie Simpson
(Westminster College, Cambridge)

THE GOSPEL: ITS ANSWER TO THE WORLD'S UNREST

I. Its Impulse to Goodwill . . . 49
By the Rev. Dr. R. C. Gillie

II. Its Power to Convert . . . 65
By the Rev. Thomas Yates

III. Its Relation to the Kingdom of Christ 76
By the Rev. E. L. Langston, M.A.

THE GOSPEL IN THE CRUCIBLE

I. The Test of Christian Experience . 93
By Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E.

II. The Test of Christian Unity . . 110
By the Rev. Dr. Norman Maclean (of Edinburgh)

III. The Challenge of the Future . . 123
By Dr. Douglas Adam

THE MENACE TO THE GOSPEL

I. The Modernist Error. 134
By the late Rt. Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield
(Bishop of Chelmsford)

II. The Sectarian Error 146
By the Rev. Dr. Norman Maclean

III. The Romanist Error 157
By the Rev. I. Siviter, M.A (of Birmingham)

CONGRESS SERMONS

PAGE

I. Centrality of the Lord Jesus Christ . 178
By the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr

II. The Church and the Kingdom . . 196
By the Very Rev. E. A. Burroughs, D.D.
(Dean of Bristol)

CHRISTIAN UNITY

I. Its Imperative Appeal . . . 210
By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Welldon
(Dean of Durham)

II. Christ its Life 225
By Canon H. A. Wilson, M.A.
(Rector of Cheltenham)

III. The Gospel its Safeguard . . . 236
By the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton

IV. Prayer its Inspiration (St. John xvii.) . 249
By the Rev. The Hon. W. Talbot Rice, M.A.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND WORLD EVANGELISATION

I. Their Essential Relationship . . 259
By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Bradford

II. The Call from the Regions Beyond . 269
By the Rev. Dr. J. H. Ritson
(British and Foreign Bible Society)

III. The Response of the Home Base . 281
By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Uganda

I. THE RAISON D'ÊTRE OF THE CONGRESS

By the Right Rev. Bishop Ingham, D.D.

We are gathered under the auspices of the World's Evangelical Alliance. I think it is due to that body to say that it has signally demonstrated the fact of deep underlying Unity amongst all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity during now a long period of years. It was the first in the field. It will hold the field when all other avenues towards reunion have been closed.

Most of us know and value its world-wide call to special and united prayer on the threshold of each new year. None of us can forget the splendid responses to its invitations to common intercession during the years of the Great War! Christian men and women who could be brought together in no other way have been glad to obey the summons of the World's Evangelical Alliance, because they have found so much in common without any loss to personal or ecclesiastical association.

Some brief explanation is due to this audience of the sort of personal contact I have with the aims of this United Evangelical Congress. I am one of those who claim a close spiritual kinship with those who were the leaders in the Church Missionary Society some fifty years ago. After learning my job I was entrusted with the care and nurture of African Daughter Churches for some fourteen years. I was afterwards Home Secretary of C.M.S. for eight years, and I now have the honour of representing the Diocese of Winchester in the National Assembly. And in these fifty years of ministry I have never changed my views! They have, I hope, deepened. They are, I hope, more definite and clear, but they are not broader than they were when I first looked up into my Master's face and saw in Jesus of Nazareth my Lord and my God—when I stood by Him outside Sychar and learnt to study the Harvest-field from His view-point, and when I learnt in the Upper Room His purpose that I must yield my body to His Spirit for world service.

It is not difficult to diagnose some of the grave reasons why we are called together at this time. You have only to run your eye

over the subjects that are to engage our attention during the next three days, to discover why we have come together. Foundation principles are being challenged! Facts of history and of Revelation which are the very basis of our Evangelical Alliance are being gainsaid! Modernist and Romanist error have become a grave menace to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour. And plans are increasingly put forward for the reunion of Christendom that seem to make confusion worse confounded. We are passing through a time of great world unrest, and we propose to meet this time with the old Gospel, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

Three words I venture at this first gathering to say. And first of all this :

(*a*) I do not believe we are going to get a unity that the Lord would bless either by watering down creeds or by levelling up ritual. Let anyone imagine this Hall filled with a great representative audience of Roman and Greek Catholics with an equivalent admixture of Anglo-Catholics. They have got, we will say, what they wanted—Orders acknowledged, perfect intercommunion, an agreed ritual, one authority. Would

the spirit of unity work where the spirit of truth was not? I dare to say it would be the unity of a corpse! A blow would have been dealt at the unity of the Spirit which we are enjoying in love and fellowship now, and which no amount of mere uniformity will command. In order to recover Gospel unity we harked back to primitive and apostolic faith and order in the sixteenth century, and when the Romans and Greeks do the same we shall get nearer to each other because nearer to the Lord. The World's Evangelical Alliance—the common platform for the great Truths we hold in common—was therefore never more necessary to maintain than now.

(*b*) My second word is this: We are promised next month in London an irresponsible Congress of Anglo-Catholics under the Presidency of the Bishop of London, and under the Chairmanship of the Bishop of Zanzibar! Side by side with that Congress in point of time will be sitting a very *responsible* gathering—no less than the governing body of the Church of England. On the one hand you will have a Congress met deliberately *to blot out the Reformation* and to popularise a return to an Anglo-Catholic mediævalism.

On the other hand, by a strange fate, the governing body of the Church of England will be finally revising the book which, more than any other, has given for 300 years an Evangelical and Protestant expression to Church of England worship. Can you imagine a more fatefully dramatic happening? The atmosphere is already becoming electric. It is necessary to speak (if one speaks at all) with a responsible sense of the seriousness of this moment. What can be done to abate the danger of a fatal collision? I think this can be done. Let there be a popular demand that neither the National Assembly nor Parliament shall permit any revision of the Office for Holy Communion! That Office was the battle-ground of the sixteenth century, and it has satisfied tens of thousands of good Church folk ever since. We know now that the Anglo-Catholics are out to turn it into something indistinguishable from the Mass, and we say "No!" And our National Assembly will soon cease to be national if it agrees thereto!

(*c*) My last word is this: We are up against a new and serious danger to Evangelical religion. It is not modernism *per se*. It is

not rationalism *per se*. It is the fact that words of unbelief that used to be spoken by outsiders are now said and preached by *insiders* in pulpits, on platforms and in reviews. I do not want to anticipate what will, I am sure, be well said by others when you come to it, but perhaps this general word may be allowed: *Disciples are losing heart!*

I suppose no disciples ever were more adrift and uncertain as to belief than those two that followed the Lord somewhere near Jordan on the strength of the Baptist's testimony! "Rabbi, where dwellest thou?" was their query. "Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε," was the reply, ("come and ye shall see").

They came inside and they Saw! We are told to-day that if we are to come inside this Christian circle we must be allowed to look all round the Christian creed *first* and see what we can accept and what we must reject, and failing that we cannot come! I believe Christ's order holds the field, and that *just as we come inside* and dwell with Him and in Him we see, and where we cannot see we find grace to wait.

We are not obscurantists, we do not deny

that some things are dark (strange if it were otherwise), but we say with St. Paul: "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known." In this spirit I for one desire to sit at the feet of the speakers at this great Congress and learn how to use the sword of the Spirit and defend the Faith in this difficult and therefore great time.

Great care has been taken to supply the most trustworthy teachers on the two great subjects of History and Revelation—which are the necessary groundwork for all that is to follow. And I am certain that you will give a hearty welcome to one whom we all revere and whose scholarship and leadership in these days have been to many as "*the Shadow of a great rock in a weary land*"—the Dean of Canterbury.

II. ITS BIRTH IN HISTORY

By Dr. H. Wace (Dean of Canterbury).

THE Gospel: Its Birth in History. That is the subject on which I am to address you, as an introduction to a series on the vast subject of Christian Unity and the Gospel. Let us, then, begin by endeavouring to realise the manner in which the Gospel first appeared in history. In the world at large, about two thousand years ago, there was no such thing. Its germ existed indeed in an obscure country and in a small nation—the Jews in Palestine. But outside that obscure race and country nothing was known or dreamt of it. There prevailed indeed a vague rumour that some potent influence might be expected from the East; but the culture of Greece and Rome alone covered the civilised world of the West. Various religions prevailed. Every region had its own religion, and none claimed general supremacy. The moral standards of life were those of the Greek philosophers, modified by the stronger sense of duty of the Romans.

These standards assumed various modifications under the several philosophies, such as those of the Epicureans and the Stoics who encountered St. Paul at Athens; but there was no authority which men generally recognised, except that there was an increasing tendency to regard the State as Divine, and to deify its rulers. In the Roman Empire, indeed, there was one centralising force at work, which soon brought the whole of the Western world under its sway. The authority of the Emperors developed into a religion, and they were worshipped as Divine. Such, to one who surveyed the world as a whole, were the only moral and religious forces at work. The traditional beliefs respecting a future life, always vague, had been discredited by Greek thought; and there was nothing beyond the realities and influences of the present world to which men and women could look for guidance. Perhaps justice is rarely done to the wonderful faith in righteousness and truth which, amid such difficulties, under what Dryden called "the dim and borrowed beams of moon and stars," kept the great leaders of Greek and Roman thought, poets, philosophers, and moralists, staunch in

their adherence to some of the cardinal principles of morality and natural religion—faith, as it were, in the unknown God after whom they were feeling.

But just at the moment when this state of things was being consolidated into the firm and hard structure of the vast Roman Empire, a small society took its origin, unobserved almost by contemporaries. While the formidable series of the twelve Cæsars was commencing, a body of twelve Jews, the twelve Apostles, commenced in Palestine to form an organised society of men and women, united in allegiance to a Jew whom they called the Christ. He had been put to death by a Roman governor in Judæa, on the charge that He had claimed to be the King of the Jews. But these twelve Jews, who said they had been commissioned by Him to be His witnesses, declared that by Divine power He had been raised from the dead, and that He was the real King not only of the Jews but of the whole world, and that He had ascended into the spiritual world which men called Heaven, and was actually ruling from thence. They said that He had shown Himself to have power over life and death, and over all

physical nature, that He had promised forgiveness and eternal blessing to all who repented of their evil and believed in Him; that He had given them commandments which were a developed form of those of the Jewish people, and that those who thus obeyed and trusted Him received His special guidance and protection, by means of His Spirit which He bestowed upon them. This small society continually increased, and within less than one hundred years it had become so numerous that the authorities of the Roman Empire were obliged to take notice of it as a power which was independent of them, and which recognised an authority independent of theirs and superior to theirs in vital respects.

They realised, in fact, that in moral and spiritual matters there was a new kingdom being formed in the world, that an increasing number of their subjects recognised that the Jewish person named Jesus Christ was their King in matters of righteousness and spiritual truth, and that their first obligation in life was to Him, and not to any authority of this world.

When this was realised, the Roman authorities accepted the challenge and exerted all

the force at their command to overthrow this kingdom and stamp it out. They felt that it was a kingdom. They saw that Jesus Christ was the Kingly Head of a vast society who absolutely submitted themselves to His laws in their moral and spiritual life, and who gave Him absolute trust as their Saviour from evil in this world and the next. The Christians were rebels against Roman authority and must be extirpated. The struggle between these two authorities, the Roman and the Christian, went on for some two centuries further. It was a desperate battle, fought at the cost of grievous bloodshed; for, though the Christians never defended themselves by force, the Roman authorities put them to death in vast numbers and with terrible cruelty.

But at length, on a sudden, the Roman Emperor recognised that his resistance to the Christian King was in vain. Constantine, at the commencement of the third century, acknowledged that Christ was supreme, and that His laws must prevail throughout the Roman world. From that time forward, even Roman Emperors acknowledged the authority of Christian bishops, as representatives of the

sovereignty of Christ, and, as in the case of Ambrose and Theodosius, submitted to rebuke and spiritual punishment at their hands. That was the history of the birth of the Gospel, till it became recognised as the one supreme authority over the Western world.

It is a marvellous drama, which needs full appreciation if we would duly realise the position which the Gospel holds in the world. It meant the establishment in the world at large of a force which has altered entirely the conditions of life, as we contemplated them two thousand years ago. From the time of the victory of Christianity over Constantine, down to the present moment, there has existed in human society, amidst all its confusion, a spiritual kingdom independent of all the kingdoms of this world, claiming supremacy over our whole moral life, and creating for us, by its revelations, a spiritual universe eternal in the heavens, in which we are all really living, and in which we shall live for ever, for weal or woe. Its king is Christ. His first ministers were the twelve Apostles, and it has been administered and promoted by Ministers who succeeded them, appointed, as they believe, in obedience to His will. It is not, and never has been,

merely a society of men who represented certain opinions, like the old Stoics and philosophers. It has been, and is, a body of men who acknowledge the supreme dominion of Christ, here and hereafter. They submit to His laws, and act in the world in accordance with His instructions.

In consequence of the weakness of human nature, divisions have arisen among them, and these divisions have various organisations, and some differences of belief in minor matters. But they all acknowledge Christ as their King. Their one rule of faith is to do His will so far as they understand it, and to spread His authority in the world. The consequence is that, however political kingdoms may change and the external circumstances of life may vary, there is now always at work a society which maintains the authority of Christ over the whole domain of human life in the moral and spiritual realms. There is always a Church in the midst of society, which is part of the kingdom of Christ, and which, under His commission, bears witness to His authority on the moral side of all human life. If wrong is done by a nation or a ruler, some Church or other is there to protest against it, and to

assert the will and law of Christ. Let other circumstances change as they may, Churches true to the allegiance of Christ have always been in the world since the Gospel was first proclaimed, and will always be there, until the end of the world. In this sense, a momentous Christian unity already exists under the Gospel; for all the Churches accept it as their supreme duty to promote obedience to Christ's will, both within their own Communions and in the world at large. The divisions of the Church have not prevented continuous recognition of the supreme fact that Christ is Lord of all, and that it is our first duty to promote the acknowledgment of that fact. In this sense, His kingdom is already one that "passeth not away." His kingdom may be struggling with the kingdoms of this world now, just as it was during the first three centuries of the Christian era. It is so struggling at this moment in Russia. But a kingdom may be firmly established while at war with its neighbours, and it is our duty and privilege to be assured that Christ's kingdom is firmly established, even when it seems most vehemently attacked.

Such, then, as a matter of broad historical

fact, is the manner in which the kingdom of Christ, establishing itself in the world, entirely altered the face of it, and modified the course of history from the first century down to the present time.

But we must go somewhat further back if we are to realise the moment of its actual birth. Its first definite proclamation was made on a mountain in Galilee, where Jesus met His eleven Apostles after His resurrection. "He came to them and spake to them, saying, All authority has been given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Those were the great final "marching orders," as they have been called, of the Church of Christ; and the sketch just drawn of the history of the Church shows how they have been obeyed, and that this is the commission which all branches of the Church are carrying out now.

We may indeed well be assured, as we look back upon that history, that the close of this

charge has been still more fully carried into effect than the rest. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." We cannot but be convinced, as we follow the failures, the errors, the sins, and the mortal weaknesses of the members of the Church, beginning even among the disciples themselves, that unless the Lord had been with them according to His promise, perpetually breathing new life into them by His Spirit, forgiving their sins, guiding their minds and supporting their hearts, the Church could never have survived the temptations and struggles to which she has been subjected. Those words of the risen Saviour stand out, at the very commencement of the life of the Christian Church, as its great standard and banner. Under the call and encouragement of those words it has worked and fought, and under the light of them it lives and works at this day.

But there are loud voices heard at present, asking who it really was who spoke them, and whether we are quite sure that He did speak them. It may, I think, reasonably be replied, in the first instance, that the best vindication of their authority is to be found in the fact

that they have, as a matter of fact, been fulfilled. It may be reasonably said that the very existence of the Church is the best proof of the Resurrection. No sane critic doubts that our Lord was crucified. If He had not risen again, how is it possible that He could have been acknowledged as King of the Christian world ever since, first of all, by His immediate disciples, and since then by an unbroken series of following generations? When we have before us this claim of authority, as uttered at the commencement of the Church, and the new creation which it implies immediately realised and subsisting to the present day, it must surely be felt that this fact alone assures us that the Author of those words uttered the voice of the supreme authority Himself.

But, for a better confirmation of our faith, it is not amiss that we should be called upon to test the authority on which we rely, and, as St. Peter bids us, "always be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear." It would be well, it may perhaps be allowed us to say, if questions concerning this hope were always asked with

that "meekness and fear," and not in the spirit of confidence and superiority which too often marks them. The first generation of Christians knew in whom they believed. Many of them, besides the Apostles, had known Christ in the flesh, and realised fully the Divine and human Personality Who had declared Himself the supreme universal King. But, under the influence of that Lord who was with them, and whose Spirit, according to His promise, guided them into the truth, they felt that the nations whom they were to teach, and future generations, ought to be given an authentic account of the Master whom they were called to trust and obey. Tradition could not be sufficient for that purpose, even if, as they well knew was not the case, it could be trusted, without a continuous and stupendous miracle, to hand down the truth unaltered and uncorrupted. That was the reason why, as we are told by one of them, "many took in hand to set forth in order an account of those things which were most surely believed among them."

Of those many efforts, four have been preserved for us, which were at once recognised

by the Church, that is to say, by the disciples of Christ and the Apostles, as entirely trustworthy, and written under the guidance of the Spirit of their Master. The first thing that it may be well to say about these four Gospels is, that they have certainly accomplished one marvellous result—it might even be said miraculous result. They have revealed a Person and a Character which has impressed Itself unmistakably upon the mind and conscience of mankind. There are differences of opinion about the details in the teaching and acts of our Lord, but the personal figure of Christ stands out in the consciousness of mankind with more vividness perhaps than any other character in human history. Whether men submit themselves, or whether they stand aloof, they all recognise the general character of Christ, and He stands before the world in those Gospels as a well-known and unique Person. If you consider the volumes which are thought necessary in the present day to describe the life and character of some great man who has passed from us, it may well be thought miraculous—that is to say, due to special inspiration—that four short tracts—for such they are—should have suf-

ficed to impress the conception of that Divine Person upon the mind and conscience of mankind. Perhaps indeed it is partly because they are short, and therefore capable of a general survey, that they have produced that impression. If the life of Christ had been written by the Evangelists at the length which volumes on the subject now occupy, it would not have come home to the ordinary man and woman as it now does; and that alone, perhaps, marks Inspiration.

But to look at them for a moment from a purely human point of view, what authority do they carry? Broadly speaking, we may say in one word that they carry the authority of men who, in the phrase of one of them, were the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Lord. After a hundred years of unbridled criticism, two or three results are settled, and they carry much else with them. There is no doubt that the third Gospel was written, like the Acts of the Apostles, by Luke, who was the constant companion of St. Paul, who was with St. Paul in Palestine, and had the opportunity of intercourse with the other Apostles and with many other contemporaries of Jesus. He was not only a highly educated

man, as his skill in narration testifies, but he was a physician, a medical man trained in the science of the day, and when he described illnesses, such as fevers, and miracles of healing, he knew well what he was writing about.

Take, in the next place, the second Gospel. Again, it is now practically admitted, as is stated in the recent work of Dr. Headlam, late Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, that tradition is right in telling us that this Gospel is the work of St. Mark recording the teaching of St. Peter. St. Mark, he says, seems to have written down the stories as they appeared to one who had seen them. There are few stories in St. Mark, he adds, which do not give one a vivid picture of events.

With respect to the other two Gospels, St. Matthew and St. John, it would take too long on this occasion to discuss the confused statements of modern criticism. But this may be said without hesitation: that no results have been established which are inconsistent with the tradition that they are in substance, at least, the work of the Apostles whose names they bear. As to St. John, we may, I think, reasonably consider that the last word was

spoken fifty years ago by M. Renan, when he said that the author must have been either St. John himself or a pretender, one who represented himself to be what he was not. It is striking, in short, to recognise that, after seventy years, criticism is very much in agreement with the view of the composition of the Gospels put forward in 1853 by Mr. Smith of Jordan Hill, the author of the memorable work on "The Voyage of St. Paul," in his *Dissertation on the Origin of the Gospels*, which has been unaccountably neglected. It is enough for my present purpose that, after three centuries of criticism, we are brought back to the simple but momentous fact that we possess in the Gospels accounts by eye-witnesses, or by witnesses in communication with eye-witnesses, of the life and teaching of our Lord. That result affords, to say the least, a firm ground on which to stand. It ought to make critics, moreover, discuss the problems and difficulties which are presented by the narratives with more of that meekness and fear which St. Peter recommends to believers. If we are in direct contact with the words, nay, sometimes with the very looks, of Christ, it ought to be felt

that we are in the presence of acts and events far superior to our intelligence, which it is natural that we should find difficult, and which can only be interpreted by profound meditation and experience.

The brevity which was imposed on the writers by their Inspiration obliged them to be content with stating great truths and acts, without adding explanations of them. Luther said that no one could understand Vergil's *Bucolics* and *Georgics* who had not spent years as a farmer in Northern Italy; and no one could understand Cicero's letters who had not had experience as a Minister of State in a Republic; and similarly, he added, no one could understand St. Paul's Epistles unless he had been in charge of the Church of God for years. In the same way it needs much of the experience of the spiritual world of our Lord and His Apostles, before a man can presume to think that he really understands the spiritual difficulties presented. But young German professors are to be found, in every generation, who can tell you positively what is the only possible meaning of this or that word of our Lord, and that this or that saying is impossible, and must be due to some subsequent interpolator. I hope I may be

forgiven if I confess that, without any disparagement of true criticism—that is to say, of true judgment—modern criticism often tempts me to exclaim with Sterne, in a passage of *Tristram Shandy* relating to dramatic critics of his day : " Grant me patience, just Heaven ; but of all the cants that are canted in this canting world, though the cant of hypocrites may be the worst, the cant of criticism is the most tormenting ! "

Read the Gospels, and you are in contact with eye-witnesses and ministers of Christ, and you will listen and criticise in all humility. At all events, there is one thing which it will be impossible for you to do. You will not deem it conceivable that companions of men who were companions of Christ, and who spoke under the influence of His Spirit, can have solemnly written down narratives which are, to use a modern euphemism, unhistorical, or, in plain words, untrue. This consideration, for instance, disposes at once, to those who accept the Gospels, of doubt respecting our Lord's virgin birth. St. Luke gives a narrative in detail of the circumstances of our Lord's birth, prefaced by an assertion that he knew " all things from the very first." If he

is not to be trusted on that solemn occasion, an occasion of infinite sacredness and delicacy, how can he be trusted elsewhere? But if he has told the truth, then, even without the corroboration of St. Matthew, there is an end of the discussion. Our Lord was supernaturally born of a Virgin.

That is the final answer to the question which, as I said, is asked of us—"Who was the person who claimed universal sovereignty and gave the Christian Church its commission?" It was the Person whose character, acts and origin are described for us with extraordinary vividness, and with solemn asseveration of truthfulness, in the four Gospels. It was Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, and the Son of God, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; who states that He came from God and went to God; who declared the will of God, and claimed the authority of God; who gave the last witness that could be given to His words by submitting to death, and shedding His blood in bitter agony, in attestation of them; who afterwards rose from the dead, and lived for a while with His Apostles, and proved His

surviving power and authority by acts of healing and similar signs. That is the Christ whose kingdom the Church represents, whose Gospel it is her office to proclaim to all the world, and who, as she is assured, will some day return to earth, to assert that kingdom finally and completely, and to deliver it up to the Father from whom He received it, that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven, and that God may be all in all.

III. ITS REVELATION IN CHRIST

By the Rev. Carnegie Simpson, D.D.

WHAT is the essential character of the Gospel? The very word declares it. The Gospel means *good news*, and if we begin by taking in that very simple definition, it at once clears away a whole world of false meanings for the Gospel. Because the essential thing about news is that you cannot manufacture it. I do not say that our friends in the press do not sometimes manufacture it; but you cannot really manufacture true news. That means that the Gospel is a thing which cannot be made or invented even by our own philosophy or our own science. Not that there is anything wrong—there is everything that is right and worthy—in the efforts and researches of our minds. What I am saying is that these things cannot invent news. That must come in some other way, which we call revelation. Therefore, the Gospel is not, and never can

be, merely ideas and ideals, merely categories of thought, or principles of ethical conduct. All these things have their place. But behind them all, behind all the exercise of our thought and all the principles of our life, there are great questions about which the world is wanting news—news of fact. And what the Gospel comes to do primarily is to tell us news of fact about those great questions which are behind all our human reasonings and all our intellectual efforts. In the world we think about things, we think about nature and life, and at the back of it all there are great questions such as these: Is the power behind all nature loving and fatherly and good? Is God love? Is our life—the moral efforts and achievements and attainments of man—something with hope in it? Can he be delivered from the bondage of sin and the defeat of death? No merely philosophical categories or principles can supply the answer. We want news about it. What is God really like? What really are the facts about the issue of the struggle with sin and death? The Gospel is primarily concerned with these great fundamental questions, telling us what otherwise

we should not know—news about God and about our own life.

What then is the real news we need to know for our life and help and salvation, first of all about God, and secondly about our own life?

The news we want about God is specially with reference to His being. There must be some Almighty Power behind the processes and functions of the world. What we really want news about is God's character—whether, in a word, God is what we call *love*. Now, observe the only kind of answer which can satisfy that question, the only kind of answer which can satisfy the question whether, as a matter of fact, it is true that God is love. Mere thoughts and mere ideas will not do it, mere emotions will not do it. We are too apt to think of love as an emotion; we too easily take our ideas of love from novelists and poets. Love is a bigger thing than any emotion. Love is so big a thing that it can be expressed only in terms commensurate with life. Love is not a way of *feeling*;—that is only a bit of it—love is a way of *living*. Let me give you an illustration. Before the War there were young fellows up at the 'Varsity, or in business, or in various lines of

life, living their life, a perfectly right and worthy and happy life. Then the call of the War came, and they left that way of living, with all the interests of the University, with all the alluring prospects before them, with all their love of home. They went away from that way of living to the dangerous, and in many ways the abominable, and, if you will pardon such a word, the *beastly* life of the trenches. It was another way of living. That was loving their country. But they were not the kind of people who had great emotion. They did not go about singing "God save the King," or decorating themselves with the Union Jack. They changed their way of living, and that was love of country. That is what I mean by saying that *loving* is a way of *living*. It is true of God too. Ultimate things are really the same for God as for man. Therefore, for God the word *love* is a way of living. Just as I do not call a man or woman loving until I see that they are living a loving kind of life, so—I say it with all reverence—I do not see how we could call God loving until we saw Him whom we call Almighty God in some real way living a life of love, which we can see. I do not see that any philosophy

or thinking about it would ever make us really to know that God was love until we saw God living a life of love before us. There is no answer to that question in Nature, in philosophy. The only answer to it is Jesus Christ, whose coming has shewn us verily that God is love. "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." The Divinity of Christ and the Deity of Christ mean many things. This is one way of putting it. He was so uniquely related to God that His life is a fact about the life of God; and if that is true, God is love. If what we see in the days from Bethlehem to Olivet—if that be a real fact about the life of God, then, with all reverence, we can say that we see God living a life of love, and we really know now that God is love. I say it with all reverence that the Incarnation was a new way of living for Almighty God. That is a way of love, and seeing that we say God is love. That is the Gospel. It is not my speculating about high thoughts regarding love and duty and idealism. That is the fact about God; that fact is in Jesus Christ, and there the Gospel concerning God is given to us.

Now turn to the other side, where we need news about man. There are a vast number of interesting questions in human life; human life is brimful of interest. There are many scientific, and philosophical, and ethical processes in the world which are full of interest. But they are not the Gospel. A mere ethical ameliorating process of human life, or a mere discussion about its philosophy, or poetry, or tragedy, or comedy—that does not give us the news that we really need about life. What is the news we need about life? Life, with all its interests and hopes and prospects, has two great insoluble problems. Human life is under a great bondage, and is under sentence of an inevitable defeat. Human life, which has so much that is sweet and beautiful and good, is at the same time under a great bondage, and the name of it is *sin*. Many people do not like the name and evade the thing. But no amount of evasion of the thing, or dislike of the word, alters the fact that there are individuals, and there is in the social life of the world, a bondage which is the real source of man's series of ills and conflicts and hatreds and fears, and which is the real implacable enemy of human progress

and happiness either in the individual or in society. Back of all the questions of human amelioration, and of things which here and there may bring him comfort and enlightenment and culture and liberty—back of them is the question, Are we ever going to be delivered from that bondage which to individuals and communities and nations alike means defeat and darkness and sin and despair?

The other thing is that man is under an eventual defeat. Most people dislike the name of death, and they deck it with flowers of speech and other flowers. But nothing of this alters the fact that, apart from the Gospel, death is the end of living and the end of loving too. We have no escape from it. Is there any news as to whether man can be, or ever will be, delivered from that menace and saved from that defeat? There is no news in Nature, there is no news in my own philosophy or in any other philosophy, there is no news in the world round about us of forgiveness. There is no forgiveness in Nature. Nature is full of beauty and interest, but there is no forgiveness in Nature. Deliverance from death? I suppose almost the sublimest

words ever said about the world round about us, perhaps the loftiest lines in literature, describe the ending of all things:

> "The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
> And, like this unsubstantial pageant ended,
> Leave not a rack behind."

That is the last word of Nature and of everything that Nature can say about the passing of things. Again, it is only because in this Christ, of whose coming we have been told, there is victory over both sin and death, and because that Christ who is so closely and uniquely related to God that His love is a fact in the life of God, is also, or can be, through love and repentance and faith, so closely related to man that His victory over sin and death becomes a fact, and a glorious fact, in our life. Here again is the Gospel; it is only in the fact of Jesus Christ telling us this news. Where else in literature, or in philosophy, or in ethics—where else is there news about the love of God, and about the salvation of man from sin and from death, except in Jesus Christ? That is the Gospel, and that is the uniqueness of the Gospel.

It means the Incarnation, and the Atonement, and the Resurrection. It means, more simply, Christ come, and Christ crucified, and Christ living. That is the meaning of the Gospel that has come to us in Him. It is news of a fact which no one else can supply.

I go on to say a word or two further—as to how this same Gospel is to be received and carried on throughout the world. Just because it comes to us not as an idea, not as a mere ethical precept, but as a fact of life, so it is to be received into our life. It is not to be received as a mere doctrine, or a mere dogma, or a mere ethic; but just as the Gospel comes to us in Christ with everything of life behind it, so the Gospel is to come into everything which makes life *living* for us. We have to receive Christ not only by some single act of faith, or some single act of repentance, or some single rite of religion. We have to receive Christ with every part of our being which makes life living—our ambitions and ideals and hopes, as well as our sins and despairs and defeats. So must we receive this news with its meaning about God's love and our salvation.

As it is thus to be brought to us, and thus

we receive it, so is it to be carried on to others. Here I will say two things. It is taken to others by our preaching and teaching, and by our lives. With regard to our preaching and teaching in ages like this, I should just like to say that this age, which has many faults and, like every age, possesses many perils, has, I think, one considerable virtue. It is an age with a real sense of intellectual sincerity. So we must in our presentation of Christ—and I am sure it will characterise the presentation of Christ at this Congress—give men of the world the impression that we are presenting Him out of intellectual as well as moral sincerity and honesty. Just because Christ has come to us as a great fact, just because Christ stands among all the facts of life's history greater than any others, just because Christ is a fact which can stand in life's history above all others—for that reason the Christian preacher has never to be afraid of facts. All facts are God's facts, whose supreme fact is Jesus Christ. Therefore, in our presentation of Christianity we must never even give the impression that we are evading or shirking any real facts which have the stamp of God's evidence upon them in a world

where He has given us His supreme fact, which is Jesus Christ.

Still more, this message of news concerning God's love and man's salvation is only to be carried to others not through the word, not through dogma, but through lives. However orthodox may be the Church's theology, however true and enlightened the message which it preaches, it is the Church, it is the men and women in the Church who are carrying out in life something of that love which God has brought us in the life of Jesus Christ which will convince the world. It is right we should preach that God loves men. But has the Church itself always loved men, has the Church, which has told men that God is love, itself loved the world which God loves and for which His Son died? Behind all orthodoxy and all the Gospel messages and all expressions of faith, there must be in all our churches a new consecration, a new giving ourselves to the service and the help of men, for whom God gave His only Son. The Gospel of the character of God, and the Gospel of the salvation of men, will never reach the world by a Church that is not producing men and women whose own lives are loving, unselfish,

faithful and true. As it came through life, the Gospel must be carried through the world of life also.

I close by recalling—I recall it very imperfectly—a story which I heard long ago from a governor of one of the provinces of India. There is a part of India where there was a little statue of a holy man or saint. The governor had asked somebody there what was the story of that little statue. It was something like this. Long, long ago there had lived there a very holy man who had spent days thinking and praying for the salvation of his race and tribe. But nothing much came of it, and more and more it was borne in upon him that the salvation of God, as he believed in God, would be brought to men only by some great act of service and sacrifice by which he should give himself for their sake. One day he went out, and left this little statue, asking that they should keep it till he came back. He never came back. He plunged himself by a great act of immolation into a dark river which ran round a mountain base, and he never returned, and the little statue is still where he left it. It is a beautiful story. It is a lesson of sacrifice and

devotion which might well touch our hearts. But, though a beautiful story, it pales away beside *our* story—beside the story of Another who plunged Himself into the dark river of man's ignorance and sin and mortality, plunged Himself into it for our salvation. And He does return. He rose triumphant and victorious, and He returns daily in His Spirit, and He is returning in every life given in humble faith and faithfulness and sacrifice—in every life saved by and given to that love of God and that salvation of man which are declared to us in Christ, and which are the meaning of the Gospel.

THE GOSPEL:

Its Answer
to the
World's Unrest

I. ITS IMPULSE TO GOODWILL

By the Rev. Dr. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.

I AM often tempted to say that the worst kind of atheism is disbelief that "God is love." For that is not only a most practical fact about God; it is an essential fact about God. The love of God is as eternal as His being, without beginning and without end, and the great doctrine of the Trinity enshrines and protects that truth. The doctrine of the Trinity is not a part of the pedantry of religion, neither is it theological lumber. It implies that God did not begin to love at some appointed time, but that His love has always been as continuous as Himself. For the doctrine of the Trinity asserts strongly society in the unity of the Godhead, and where there is perfect society the streams of love always flow. When we say we believe in the Trinity we are just presenting the outside aspect of this tremendous truth, "God is love." The Gospel is the application of the eternal love

of God to man in his need and his impoverishment by sin.

But if disbelief in the love of God is the worst kind of atheism, I must hasten to add that misbelief concerning the love of God is, I think, the most formidable form of heresy. People take that great word, "God is love," and read their own meaning into *love*, thus making it not a guiding star but a misleading will-of-the-wisp. "God is love." To understand that sentence, so sublime in its simplicity, and so unfathomable in its brevity, we need to read the context as well as the three brief words—the context from which it is so often detached. We do not know whether the writer of these words had them given to him through mystical inspiration, or by immediate revelation, but he does show us that they emerged as his supreme conviction through a study of the Cross. "God is love," he wrote, and immediately goes on to say: "Herein was the love of God manifested in our case, that God hath sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him." And as if that was not plain enough, he adds: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son

to be the propitiation for our sins." Once more when he prepares to repeat this starry sentence, "God is love," he prefaces it by again referring to the Gospel certainty—"We know and have believed the love that God hath in our case.. God is love."

There is no necessary quarrel between Mysticism and Evangelicalism. But it ought to be recognised that the most precious conviction of the Mystic that God is love was first born from an experience of the Gospel in the heart of the writer of the First Epistle of St. John. I disclaim any contradiction between the Mystic and the Evangelical. The writer of this First Epistle was both. But if a distinction is to be pressed, let it be clearly said that the Evangelical experience preceded the Mystical, and that the Mystic borrows from the Evangelical his sovereign conviction.

There are some people who are rather ashamed of the term *Evangelical*. Like other great and glorious terms, it is sometimes misused and sometimes abused. I glory in it, and I am thankful that our Society has it right in the forefront of its title—the World's Evangelical Alliance. If it is misunderstood it is our business so to proclaim what an

Evangelical really is, that it may come to be rightly understood.

I put this right in the forefront. I am trying to point out to you that this supreme revelation, God essentially and eternally Love, came to the Apostle who gives it to us through his experience of the Cross. Another way of saying the same thing is this: The eternal ocean of the love of God was only discovered by the supreme Sacrifice which flowed into Palestine in Jesus Christ, and overflowed into the world at the Cross. It is God's special giving which has proved to us His continuous loving. We only see the Cross eternally in the heart of God when we behold the Son of God on the Cross of Calvary. It is the Gospel of forgiveness and of life that at once creates and guarantees an unquestioning conviction that God is essentially Eternal Love. It is the same Gospel which demands from man, and provides in man, the grace of loving his fellows. All the other influences towards love which play about us and ennoble us are either partial in their application, or limited in their pressure, or spasmodic in their activity. Love of family, for instance, or love of comrades, or love of country, or love of mankind

for man's own sake, fails somewhere, is baffled by some barrier, defeated by some sudden lapse of power. The full tide of the sacrificial impulse, without which goodwill becomes at some point but a vague gesture, flows from the Cross through men conscious of the overwhelming grace of God in forgiveness.

It is just here that so many people fail, at least, in their public utterances. Great statesmen and great newspapers have urged the supreme necessity of a "change of heart" if the peace of the world is to be re-established. That marks an almost incalculable advance. I remember, when a young man, that though we had believing statesmen, and we had newspapers that were not against Christianity, it was very rarely that you could get a crisp and definite statement at that time, that the great necessity for the good of mankind was a change of heart in man. It is a great advance. But they all hesitate at this point—they fail to go on to indicate how the change of heart is to be wrought, they fail to go on to indicate an impulse vast enough and continuous enough to secure a change of heart in men and nations. They borrow the Evangelical phrase, but they are afraid to define it

and justify it by the Evangelical message. It is left to us humble preachers of the Gospel to speak where they fall silent, and to dare where they are daunted. We say it is the contemplation of the love of God at the Cross which alone can empower men to show unconquerable goodwill. It is idle to speak about a change of heart for men and nations unless you tell them what the influence is to be that is to change their hearts. I see a great deal of courage in political men to-day and in the best newspapers, but I dare to say that there are very few, either politicians or statesmen, who dare to be Evangelical in their utterances, however moral and religious they are. And yet it is the Evangelical message which alone can justify and define the familiar Evangelical phrase.

We are not without proofs that sufficient goodwill can be generated from this source—the love of God at the Cross—to solve problems which are apparently hopeless. I am going to take two historical instances. Because there is nothing more certain than that if you go into the streets of London and say that the great source of goodwill is the love of God in Christ, people will stare at you,

and those who do not stare at you will challenge you to show proof. No cleavage between nations, and no chasm between classes in our modern day, is more implacable than the cleavage and the chasm between Jew and Gentile in St. Paul's day. The Greek, aristocrat of intellect, scorned the Barbarian, and the Jew, trustee of religion, contemned the Pagan. There was an incessant duel between the Jewish race and the Gentile people, a duel which sometimes deepened into fanaticism. The Jew could only be reconciled to the Greek by becoming Greek in outlook and culture, and the Greek to the Jew by becoming a Jewish proselyte. What a recoil we detect in those words of St. Peter, Christian though he was: "No, no, my Lord, I have never eaten anything common or unclean." But the miracle of reconciliation was wrought, and St. Paul was able to write, fearless of contradiction: "Christ is our peace, He who has made both of us a unity and destroyed the barrier which kept us apart." And again: "He makes peace by the creation of a new man in Himself out of both parties, so as Himself to give the death-blow to the feud between Jew and Gentile by reconciling them

both to God in one body through the Cross." These were not idle words. The erstwhile Pagan and the continuing Jew, both Christians, sat together at the Lord's Table and loved each other. The slave and the slave-owner, the rights of the one and the duties of the other only half recognised, met as brethren in the Church of Christ. Onesimus, the run-away slave, and Philemon, the master who had been wronged, could be brought together; for Paul wrote to the owner of Onesimus: "Onesimus is no longer a mere slave, but something more than a slave—a beloved brother, especially dear to me, but how much more to you as a man and a Christian." There spoke a voice from the Cross, triumphant, making fellowship. That was a miracle. The miracle was repeated on a vast scale.

Let none say that the power for goodwill of the sacrificial love of Christ has lapsed, and that such results cannot be paralleled to-day. It may be a twice-told tale to some here, but it is well worth while reminding any cynic, whom you meet outside, of this fact. In 1895 Argentina and Chile, which ought to have been the firmest of friends, after their mutual struggles for liberty, fell

into controversy concerning their frontier, which was supposed to follow the crest of the Andes. People could not be sure which was the very top of the crest. The question was submitted to Britain, but the arbitration was delayed. Steadily the two Republics drifted towards war. Then a preacher in one country began to plead for peace in the name of Christ. His voice was re-echoed from the other side of the Andes. Many of the citizens of both countries pressed for a peaceful solution of the problem. Britain at last suggested a plan which seemed to do justice to both sides, and war was averted. To celebrate their escape from a death-dealing conflict, the two countries placed a monument on the great mountain chain which divided them and had nearly brought them to war. The monument, a figure of the great Prince of Peace, was cast from the cannon which the two countries would have used against each other, and upon it were inscribed these words : " Sooner shall this monument crumble to dust than the people of Argentina and Chile break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ their Redeemer." That was a notable victory won by the goodwill which

the sacrificial love of Christ engenders. It is a proof that there is still sufficient impulse to brotherhood in the Cross of Christ, if men will seek to rediscover it and receive it.

There is another monument to the demands and bestowals which the Gospel of God's forgiving love begets, a monument not to any prince, but a product of the Prince of Peace in hearts of goodwill. I allude to the League of Nations. But this monument is not yet completed. The passions which make for war have not yet been sufficiently transmuted into the purposes which make for peace to secure its completion. Sometimes it seems as if it would remain but a torso without any tribute to Him without whose influence its work will never be accomplished. It may be truer to say that the monument is not yet really begun, but only the mould prepared from whence it is to issue. It is for men with experience of the Gospel, and with confidence in the transforming power of the Gospel, to throw their strength into its making. Otherwise it will have added another to the pathetic attempts of mankind to destroy the hereditary evil in the race, pathetic attempts which so often become tragical failures. But I believe that

if Christian people will but rally to it, another demonstration can be completed that in the straits of the soul the Cross makes its deepest appeal and wins its surest victories. Those whom we called "enemy nations" must be included in the League of Nations if it is to achieve its high end. They cannot be included without a readiness for forgiveness on the part of the conquering nations. Whence will that impulse to forgiveness come, and come in sufficient power, if not from the forgiveness of God, beneath which both men and nations must take shelter if they are to have hope?

I want to press upon you that even whilst there are many failures in the revelation of goodwill that flows from love for a suffering Christ, amongst individuals as well as between nations there is continual demonstration of its power. I want to give you a striking example that happened in the days of the War in London. A great friend of mine, a distinguished Cambridge graduate who is now a professor in America, was working for the Y.M.C.A. in France. Working there he met an Indian secretary of the Y.M.C.A., a brilliant man also. They came together to London.

In London there were a number of Indian troops and a number of English officers in charge of them. For some reason or other my friend, the Cambridge man, went down to visit these officers and took with him his Indian friend, who, he thought, could do admirable work for Christ among the Indian troops. They went and were pleasantly received, and then came the time for luncheon. The officers said to my friend, the Cambridge graduate, "We will be very glad if you stay to luncheon, but, of course, your Indian friend —we will make other arrangements for him." My friend said, "No, he and I are together, brothers in labour and in service. If you cannot have him you won't have me." That was Christian goodwill conquering something that was less than goodwill; and though I have many words to speak, appreciative words and generous words, of many of our officers, that group of officers failed. But the Christian impulse conquered. And all over the world in many a spot, at this very hour, the missionary servants of Jesus Christ are showing that they can overcome differences of caste and class and race because of the impulse to goodwill from the Cross.

The hardest trial for men of goodwill remains to be mentioned. It is the maintenance of kindly feeling when differences of conviction and outlook can neither be obliterated nor overlooked. With both men and nations there recur from time to time obstacles apparently irremovable in the pathway to true unity. But the spirit of the Gospel is not defeated when such an impasse is reached. In one of the noblest sentences in his Lectures on "Ephesians," Dr. Dale says this: "Controversy is one of the fullest opportunities for the exercise of Christian love." With a great many people controversy is the invitation to the forgetfulness of Christian love. St. Paul expressed the same thought in a phrase which may be translated, as by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "Truthing it in love." It is a question of attitude. In argument we should desire nothing but the victory of truth in a spirit of goodwill. Controversies conducted in such a spirit are, alas, few between individuals and communities in either Church or State. Christ's people have often failed calamitously just here. But the failure is not because of insuperable difficulty, but from insufficient impulse from the Cross of Christ.

I remember a woman, one of the fairest Christian characters I ever met. She was a very winning person, full of charm, and she could have sailed through the world upon the wings of other people's admiration without any difficulty. But she had a higher conception of her duty. Whenever she saw a friend or relative making a mistake, doing wrong in some vital way, she would feel it her duty to tell them. What do you think her experience was? She never offended them. I do not know a single instance in which she offended them. Why? Because she loved them so much, and they knew she loved them. When even the sharp point of the scalpel was pressed into their soul, just because they knew that she loved them enough there was no resentment. That is a picture of the higher excellence which Christian people and Christian communities have to acquire. We have to learn to speak the truth in love, and to wage our controversies with goodwill. There is nothing that would make me more ashamed of the Evangelical cause than this—that we should champion the truth in the spirit of hate, or of bitterness. There is no triumph which I think would more glorify God than

this triumph—that we should present our cause, and make our criticisms, and speak the truth that God has revealed to us, continually in the spirit of goodwill.

We need not be defeated here. There have been proofs, in recent years, in repeated conferences between men of widely different convictions concerning religions and economics, that goodwill can abide in the midst of controversy, just as peace can be found in the heart of a storm. The love which Christ is pouring into the world, wherever He can find true hearts to receive Him, will yet prove itself mighty to unite in common aim and impulse men who differ both widely and deeply. In this faith we must love and serve and sacrifice. In such a cause as this, in which we unite where we can, though we differ where we must, there is some hint of the spirit which will yet control, while it cannot conquer, controversy among us. It is not always our Lord's will to still the tempest by His sovereign word, "Peace, be still." But the love which He has caused to spring in our hearts can be as the oil on the stormy wave, so far controlling it that no barque need founder and no human wreckage be cast

upon the shore. Towards that experience we must struggle, and for that result we must learn the deeper lessons from the love of our Redeemer. Oh, that we may have the vision —and, in spite of our failures and shortcomings, rejoice in it—the vision of George Fox, who said: "I saw a great ocean of darkness and death cover the earth; but I saw a greater ocean of light and life, and it covered the ocean of darkness and death."

II. ITS POWER TO CONVERT

By the Rev. Thomas Yates

If it were asked of Evangelical religion what is its most sure and persistent testimony, by all its history and in all the confidence of an ever-renewed experience, the answer would be, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." In this we are not in any wise divided among ourselves, "all one body we"; neither are we in truth divided in this from our fellow-Christians who view our common faith and religion from a different standpoint from our own. Thank God, there are crucial points not a few where we meet, and this is one of them. View the working of Divine grace upon the soul and life as you will in its method, mediation and rationale, he is no Christian at all who knows not that it is the power of Divine salvation for man. To this witness of present experience is added the

testimony of the great cloud of witnesses who in life conquered the power of death: "To Him that loveth us and has loosed us from our sins by His blood, to Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever."

(1) Evangelical Christianity is marked by its points of emphasis—the soul's direct relationship to God, the freedom of the Spirit, the authority of the Scriptures, the centrality of the Cross; and as certainly and definitely as upon any of these its emphasis has been upon the need and the reality of Conversion. With its determination and claim to hold close to the New Testament, it could not lose or lessen such an emphasis. Met on the threshold of the New Testament with the boldest and deepest-going declaration our Lord ever made about man, "Ye must be born anew," the fact is not allowed to escape through all those gospel records that it was the very purpose of Jesus to call men into a new order of life, and that His gift to them was the power to arrive and live there. He brought men, not simply a new way of regarding God and themselves and life in its wholeness and its destiny, but a dynamic that lifted them out of an old way of living into

a new way, constraining them from within, changing them at the centre of thought, purpose and action, so that they are come into the world of new judgments, new values, new emotions, new moral standards and spiritual aspirations. His only answer to those who asked for His credentials was to point to what He was actually doing for and in men. His answer was not in the terms of argumentation, but in the terms of changed men; so changed that the blind were seeing, and to every one of them whom He healed and empowered life was a different thing. His reply to those questioners was not to bid them repeat something which He had said to them, but to go and tell what they had seen.

After His resurrection and ascension, His waiting and believing friends made the tremendous discovery that what they had seen Him do for men before their eyes was but the beginning of the things He would go on doing, and that, lost to their vision, He was with them, a dynamic Presence by His Spirit, with the same vital reality, charged still with the power of remaking men, of opening their eyes, of turning them from darkness

to light that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and that they should repent and turn to God. So straightway there began to be shaped that remarkable vocabulary of Christian conversion and regeneration, words and phrases hammered out at white heat as they came from the crucible of experience, —"born from above;" "translated out of darkness into light;" "redeemed from iniquity;" "turned from the power of Satan unto God;" "putting off the old and putting on a new man;" "passing from death unto life;" "dying and rising again." All this is gathered up in St. Paul's word when he says that the Gospel is the power of God, and in this whole matter of the power of the Gospel to convert I recall some great words of Dr. Glover in which he states the apologetic of a past and a living experience: "The Gospels are not four but ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, and the last word of every one of them is, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world'"

(2) Conversion as it stands associated with the Christian Gospel, describes then a fact of experience. But all its value and sig-

nificance come from that association. Conversion is itself just an old human fact, an experience common to the race, and not in any wise limited to men under the influence of one religion. There are all kinds of conversions, and every serious helper of men is out for this. Seneca declared it to be his chief task "to save souls," and said of himself, "I regard myself not so much as a reformed man but as a transfigured man." So speaks the ethical philosopher when he is in earnest, and so speaks every religious teacher. Conversion stands at the gate of every religion, and, as someone has said, "The conversion of Gotama is as typical for Buddhism as the conversion of Saul for Christianity." The meaning and nature of conversion depend upon its impelling motive and its goal. We are thinking of Christian conversion, and into this there enters in our observation and experience something which can only be described by a term much more theological. I can only speak of Christian conversion if it is understood to mean, not simply—though I do not know that this is at all simple—the complete turning round of a man in his ways, but that change wrought by the Divine Spirit

in his innermost self and in the deep springs of his personality which we call regeneration. This is something we can recognise only in its fruits, and we can no more lay a definition on its method and order than Jesus could when He said that it was as the wind which bloweth as it listeth. But we know it when it is come, and when we speak of the power of the Gospel to convert we mean not only its power to lay such an arrest upon man as to cause him to turn about in his ways, but that in the power of the Gospel there is something done for and in him which he cannot do for himself, and which brings about that new creation of which the New Testament speaks with a joy that rings like a silver bell.

(3) What then is it in the Gospel which has this power to regenerate? It is that in the Gospel which makes God overwhelmingly real to men, and at the same time offers and opens a way for man into new personal relationship with God. And the great Christian declaration—the good news—is that God has revealed Himself to man in a commanding and final way in Jesus Christ. Let us not be under any illusion about this. It is not any of our doctrines or dogmas, or our credal

interpretations, but just that which is central and basal in our faith—Jesus Christ the Son of God who gave Himself for us, and in whom God was and is reconciling the world unto Himself.

I look closely into the history of Christian conversions, and I watch them coming to pass to-day, and always I see that it is one thing only—the impact of the Living Christ arresting and awakening the spirit of man and making God the supreme unescapable Reality, and His grace of forgiveness and power enabling a man to live the one kind of life that is fit for those who know that they are forgiven and trusted children of the Holy Father. It is only another way of saying this to say that every revival of vital religion has been associated with some fresh discovery and realisation of the significance of Jesus Christ.

I am not trying to compress a treatise on Christian theology within the limits of a brief address, and it is not for me to speak of the profound actuality of the Atonement. We believe that Jesus gathered up His revelation of the nature, character and purpose of God into one vast eternal deed in His Cross,

and it is a thing of ever newly confirming experience that it is at Calvary, as nowhere else, that men feel that they have met the final truth about God, and that it must for ever command them. I do not mean that the only thing in Christ that arrests and saves men is His death, or that it is always the first thing. You cannot tell out of what aspect of Christ the arrest and mastering of the human spirit may come. You cannot tell how or where He may come upon a man, or by what gate of access He may enter savingly into a human life. Only He brings *God* with Him always as no one else does or can, and soon or late, whatever it may be in Him that has subdued and captured the soul, it is His Cross that completes the conquest, for it is there supremely that the Love, so amazing, so divine, is known as the Love that must command soul and life and all.

(4) Such a theme as this is related in no artificial way to the general theme of this Conference. It is part, and a vital part, of the answer of the Gospel to the world's unrest. I remember that when wild war broke loose, and many were asking with startled minds whence this calamity had come,

one of our modern teachers gave a short reply. Like others, he asked through what bulwark, shattered and ruined now, had this dark flood poured. He answered, "Simply for this reason, namely—Europe to-day is not unanimous about God. It is without any decisive and implacable sense of the Nature of God." The short answer reached the deep tragic truth. But it is the truth and tragedy always in the world's unrest. Its indifference to God, its alienation from Him, its divided mind about His Reality, and especially about His Character—this is the troubled sea, casting up mire and dirt, and upheaving in waves of sheer destruction. To this chaotic whole of human life Christianity offers Jesus Christ as the final truth about God, and so the clue to every enigma which life and the world present.

I am not of mind to set a gospel of individual redemption over against a gospel of social and national redemption, for the Gospel of Christ is a power of salvation in the large as in the little, and for the whole as for its parts. Nor do I think of a community or of a world converted to God as simply a community or world of people who have each

separately come to know and find hope and a restored soul in Christ. The range and relations of the individual and the collective life are not the same. But the power that converts one can convert the other. The power that can handle this intractable human nature can transform and recreate those relations through which human nature expresses itself and in which it lives its life—home, commerce, culture, art, amusement, politics, government and state—and can shape the democracies of the nations into an aristocracy of character and soul.

We may rejoice in a recovered emphasis in our time upon our Lord's doctrine of the kingdom of God among men. That kingdom cannot mean less for us than the Christianising of our civilisation, the rule of God over every relationship and affair of humanity. But its procedure is from personal centres. It works by redeemed men and women, and extends as a leaven of character. I like the downrightness of the Bishop of Pretoria's words: "If Christ cannot change human nature from the heart outwards, He is indeed a pretender to the kingdom of God. If He cannot make character, He can make nothing.

The saving contribution of Christianity to life is theological virtue. Character, that is, moulded to the core of Godwardness. This is God's remedy for the world's heart-disease."

Christian conversion is profoundly and searchingly ethical, or it is nothing of much consequence. There be many panaceas for the world's trouble, and many who cry "Lo here" and "Lo there," but the first and mightiest thing that can be done for the world will be done by whoever can persuade men that the problems of personal character are basal and determinative, and who can show man, who wants a better world, the open way to it through better men. Here it is that Christ enters upon the restless scene, with His answer to the world's disquiet in the terms of changed men redeemed into a kingdom of love and service out of the slavery of self. He alone walks surely over the troubled sea of the world's unrest. He alone can bid its angry tumult cease, because He alone can say with power, "Peace, be still," to that soul of man which is before all circumstance, and more enduring and mighty than all events.

III. ITS RELATION TO THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST

By the Rev. E. L. Langston, M.A.

THE Gospel always means good news. It has been good news in the past, it is good news to-day for the individual soul that trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is glorious good news for the future.

The Gospel not only brings news to the sinner concerning personal salvation, but has a message for this sin-stricken, distracted world of ours, a message that is going to bring world-wide peace and blessing. The truly instructed Christian can never be a pessimist. While he has a Bible and he studies that Bible, God reveals to him His plans and purposes for this world, and those plans and those purposes are perfect with regard to God's goodwill and blessing that He means to pour out upon the sons of men.

Before I speak of the coming and of the kingdom of Christ, I just want to refer for a few moments to the extraordinary age in which

we are now living, and the history of the past ten years. I want to do this so that we may by contrast see something of the glories that await this world of ours. Do we realise that during the past ten years, within seven of those years, twenty-four thrones have been overthrown, including three of the greatest land empires of the world? We have seen that happen during these last few years, and to-day only seventeen of the previously forty-one royal dynasties are left. During those years we have seen the worst war that has ever taken place, costing over ten million lives and over forty thousand million pounds. We have experienced the worst famine the world has hitherto known, in which millions have perished through starvation and disease. We have endured the worst pestilence known to man, exacting a toll of over twelve million lives, concerning which the Sanitary Commissioner for India wrote in *The Times* of 12th April, 1919: "It is an epidemic in many respects without parallel in the history of disease." These are startling things. To-day, as one looks round upon the world filled with unrest, there is concern at the horrors and development of Bolshevism on the Continent.

There is wonder at the continued impasse between nation and nation on the Continent. The question is being asked, "Whither are we drifting in India?" We look at what once was the great Empire of China, also in a state of revolution and unrest. The man who really thinks, looks at the conditions of men in all countries, and tries to get to the depths of the great social questions of the large cities and towns of the world—the overcrowding, the unemployment, the strange inequalities of life, the one in the West End with wealth, and the other in the East End living amidst squalor and dirt and shame. We look abroad and see the masses of heathen going into eternity without a knowledge of Christ and surrounded with every kind of cruelty and sin. We ask the questions, Why has God allowed these things? does God care? why is this old world of ours filled with these problems which perplex, which we cannot understand? The man in the street who thinks, as well as the philosopher, is asking the Church a question, "Is there any solution to this terrible state of affairs in the world? Have we any Gospel, any good news to announce with regard to these things? Is

there any possibility of doing away with the source, the very root of this condition of affairs?" The Socialist, the Bolshevist, and many another have undoubtedly their schemes for the betterment of the world. Poets have dreamed and written of a golden age that must come to this earth. The thought of such an age is talked of and written about. Is there a golden age? What has the Church to say about the golden age? Is there ever to be a time when there shall be peace on earth and goodwill among men?

That is the question which we want to discuss, and with our Bibles in our hands we want to open them up and see what is God's purpose for this distracted world of ours. As we open the Bible and read its pages, one thought comes out predominant, and that is, "The Lord reigneth." There is an all-wise Providence at the helm of affairs. Ever since the Fall of man, as it is recorded in the opening chapters of Genesis, we find that God has been endeavouring to set up on this earth a kingdom of righteousness. For the past six thousand years of recorded history God has been overruling the affairs of men to this end, and preparing men for that great

age. To this end men in general have had to learn many lessons. One is the holiness of God, another is the sinfulness of sin, another is the absolute and utter helplessness of man by his own efforts, in his own strength, to better himself. Man has tried every type of government he can devise. There have been patriarchal, judicial, monarchic, despotic, military, republican, and parliamentary governments, and we have seen latterly bolshevistic governments. All have been tried and all have failed to satisfy the cravings of men's hearts, and to meet man's need. We have not yet seen the ideal kingdom established on this earth. Now this Book reveals to us God's intention that the kingdoms of this earth shall some day become " the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," and that under His reign the devil will be dethroned, sin and selfishness will be curbed, and there will be a reign of righteousness, and of peace and goodwill amongst all men.

The question is, But how and when is that kingdom to be set up? Our Lord taught us to pray in the Lord's Prayer, " Thy kingdom come." What do we mean by these words? Amongst us there are two distinct schools of

interpretation about the coming and establishment of the kingdom of God. I am not going into details about these two views of interpretation but just name them. One interpretation is, that the kingdom of God will be established after some centuries of Christianising society and nations and, through the nations, the whole world. Thus the world slowly but surely will become better and better, and we will get to that state when the kingdom of God is perfected amongst men. This view is becoming increasingly popular to-day throughout Christendom, and is mainly accepted as the standard of interpretation, because so many of our great thinkers and writers to-day write from this standpoint.

But I want to remind you of the Jewish conception of the kingdom of God and the Christian conception of the kingdom of God, right up to one hundred years ago, and still held by a large number of Evangelicals. As we study the writings of the Old and New Testaments from that standpoint, we find that the kingdom of God is to come to this earth by steps and stages till one great event. The first step towards the

bringing in of that kingdom was when God dealt with Abraham; when, in Genesis xii., we have recorded God's remarkable oath to Abraham. God entered into an agreement with him, and in that agreement there were seven clauses, and the seventh clause was like this: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." That is the first step revealed to us in detail about God's plan for this world. Has God fulfilled His covenant with Abraham? Some will say, "Yes, in the Lord Jesus Christ." Then I ask, how is it that there are eight hundred million people on the face of this earth who as yet do not know God in the face of Jesus Christ? Therefore that covenant with Abraham has not yet seen its full fulfilment. Let me remind you how that God reiterated that covenant to the Patriarchs. But, wrapped up with that covenant, in Gen. xv. 18 a land was promised to Abraham and his seed which they should possess "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates"—the promised land destined to be the centre of God's kingdom on earth.

The next great step towards the establishment of God's kingdom on this earth is God's

oath to David. In 2 Sam. vii. it is recorded how that David had it in his heart to build a house for his God; for this purpose he gathers together gold and silver and precious stones and other materials. He then is told by Nathan the prophet of God what is God's purpose for David—that his house, his throne, his kingdom, should be established for ever; and the details of that covenant with David are given in that same chapter. David, writing of that covenant in the eighty-ninth Psalm, says: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. . . . My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me." On these and similar bedrock promises the whole superstructure of Hebrew prophecy, concerning the Messianic kingdom and the Messiah, stands. God's oaths to Abraham and David cannot and will not be set aside.

The question which divides us is as to the interpretation of these covenants. Are we to

see a spiritual or a literal fulfilment of these promises? Do they refer to a spiritual kingdom or a literal kingdom? Personally I believe they refer to both. There is no doubt whatever as to what Abraham thought of the terms of that covenant, and what the seed of Abraham thought. It was to be a literal kingdom. There is no doubt as to what David thought. In the closing verses of 2 Sam. vii. David seems to clinch the argument, as far as he was concerned. He believed it was to be a literal throne and a literal kingdom. And the literality of these promises was believed in implicitly by the Prophets afterwards, right away down to our Lord's day. The Jews believed in, and still believe in, a literal fulfilment of these promises to Abraham and to David.

Now we come to the New Testament, to the announcement of the angel Gabriel to the Virgin Mary with regard to the Lord Jesus (St. Luke i. 31–33): "Thou shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom

there shall be no end." Again we ask the question, Is this to be taken literally or spiritually? John Baptist, thirty years later, suddenly startles the whole of Palestine with his message, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." No sooner does the Lord Jesus appear than He too utters the same message, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," and immediately, like a thrill, the whole of the Jewish community throughout that country was stirred to the heart. A Messianic kingdom—was it about to be established? When our Lord chose the twelve, and later the seventy, the burden of their message was the coming of the kingdom. In the later half of His ministry there is not so much about the kingdom as in the first half. The kingdom of God in the Old Testament and in the New is always connected with the Person and Presence of the Messiah—the Christ—the Son of David. He came to reign as King Messiah, but the Jews crucified their King and rejected Him.

As we study the Gospels and our Lord's parables with regard to "the kingdom of heaven," at first we are mystified. All through the Old Testament the burden is

that upon this distracted world the kingdom is to be established. And now the King has been rejected and crucified. How are we to interpret this "kingdom of heaven" that is spoken of? Might I say it is imperative, if we would understand this subject aright, that we should try to find out the meaning of these phrases, "kingdom of God," and "kingdom of heaven." As I understand it, in the kingdom of God, God is Sovereign; He reigns in the Universe over all created creatures, and that kingdom includes time and eternity, heaven and earth. God's sovereign reign. I think we are all agreed there.

But now we turn to St. Matthew's Gospel, and there thirty-two times over we get the expression "kingdom of heaven." In almost every place where it is enlarged upon it is spoken to us as a mystery. Never in the past, when the kingdom of God is concerned, is there any mystery about it. It was clear and unmistakable—viz. an established kingdom upon the earth. Now we get the mystery, "kingdom of heaven." As we study "the kingdom of heaven" in the light of those parables, we find that its character is defined and described. We find also that

" the kingdom of heaven " is limited both as to its time and its sphere, and the limitation is between the first and second Advents of Christ. Again, as we study " the kingdom of heaven " parables, we are amazed to find that " the kingdom of heaven " is a mixture of good and bad, of wise and foolish, and, in the drag-net parable, of good fish and bad fish. How do we account for that? Also, we find that " the kingdom of heaven " comes to an end at the end of the age; and at the end of the age in each case there is a separation between the wheat and the tares, between the good and the bad, between the wise and the foolish virgins when the Bridegroom comes.

As one studies " the kingdom of heaven " in the light of the Church of Christendom, one wonders whether one has not got the key to the significance of " the kingdom of heaven." In all churches there are wheat and there are tares, there are good and there are bad, there are wise and there are foolish; and there is no separation, as far as the Church is concerned, till the end of the Church age. The kingdom of God, we find, can only be entered into by a new birth from above—

"born again." It is "spiritual" in this present age. "It cometh not with observation," and everyone who is "born again of the Spirit" is a member of the kingdom of God. So far, the kingdom of God is not yet established on this earth, except in its spiritual form, in the members of the true Church of God.

The question is, Are we to wait some centuries for the establishment of that kingdom upon earth? or is there to be a sudden establishment of that kingdom? It is very striking as one studies the prophetic Scriptures on this point. The Book of Zechariah has much to say about it. In Zech. xiv. we see the coming King: "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives." A literal fact. Following on that statement, we read in the ninth verse of that same chapter, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth." Or we take that Messianic Psalm, Ps. ii., where we get the definite statement of God in heaven: "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." Jerusalem is definitely associated with the King, in Ps. ii. Jer. xxiii. 5: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch,

and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." The whole burden of the book of Revelation is the manifestation of a coming King who is to reign as " King of kings and Lord of lords." The closing verses of Zech. xiv. give us another picture of the nations of the earth coming to worship the King in Jerusalem. The prophetic Scriptures clearly teach that there is to be a very definite literal reign of the Son of David; and that His kingdom is to be established and set up on this earth at the Advent of the King as described in Zech. xiv. 3, 5, 9.

We naturally ask the question, When is this golden age to come? Some of us who are studying these things very closely feel, and feel very strongly, that day is not far off, but " Of that day and hour knoweth no man." These past years which we have been going through have been speaking to us very solemnly, as we have seen the predicted signs of the times coming to pass, forewarning us that this age is about to close. One of the most amazing things, from the point of view of the student of Prophecy, is the opening up of those old Bible lands given to the seed

of Abraham in Gen. xv. 18 as the Promised Land, namely, Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia. We remember, in the Old Testament days, that these lands were the centre of world culture and civilisation. Isaiah prophesied that a period of desolation would come upon that whole Near East. Ezekiel prophesied the same. But in the prophecies of Isaiah, xi. to xix. and other passages, it is definitely stated that in the latter days restoration would come to Palestine and Egypt, and restoration would come to that area which we call Mesopotamia. We are living in the very age, after centuries of desolation, when these things are coming to pass, and we are beginning to see life coming into these very countries which the old Prophets said should be desolate until that day. We see that that nation which has been scattered all over the world all these centuries is now coming together; and in a remarkable way during these past few years the nations of the earth have given facilities to these people to go back and make Palestine their national home. In the light of Prophecy these things to some of us have the utmost significance. We feel that it is the beginning of

that preparation for the establishment of that kingdom which was promised so many years ago to Abraham and David, when God's King should reign upon this earth. "It shall come to pass," Isaiah said about that kingdom, "in the last days"—and this can only be translated literally—"that the mountain," or kingdom, "of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge among the nations."

What is it that the world needs to-day? It needs a righteous Judge, a righteous Leader, a righteous King whom the world can trust. "And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." That is God's

plan for this distracted world of ours. When the King comes, His first act, as revealed in the Book of Revelation, is to bind the devil who is the cause of all our perplexities. St. John, in his first Epistle, chapter v. 19, says: "The whole world lieth in the evil one." This evil one's days, thank God, are numbered and his doom is sure. The days are not far off when he shall be unable any longer to work his fell designs, for when the Lord Jesus manifests His presence, having bound the devil and his hosts of wickedness, then there will be peace on earth and good-will among men. May God grant that that day may soon be here.

THE GOSPEL IN THE CRUCIBLE

I. THE TEST OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

By Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E.

THE statement has been freely and recently made that, since the War and because of the War, "Christianity is on its trial." I suggest that it is nothing of the sort. The exact contrary is the truth. We are on our trial—as individuals and as a nation. Not the Gospel, but our trust in the Gospel, is in the crucible. In other words, our faith is being tested. We were like Job. We were in secure prosperity and, suddenly, our sons were killed, our wealth was consumed. We are left stricken, with deliverance forgotten, with confidence shaken, and, like the heathen, we are ready to blame and beat our God. Nominal Christianity, tried by fire, is shown to be dross. It declares that we had no high ideals! It is asking, Was it worth while? Faith answers, that we were called to a great enterprise; many of us cast our all into the treasury of noble sacrifice.

We have not lost what we gave. The true metal will come forth as gold.

What do we mean by Christianity? I define Christianity as the belief, and the Gospel as the assertion, that Jesus is "The Christ." That was the test applied by Jesus to the faith of His disciples. Their belief was not proof against the fear of men until it was translated into visible reality by the Resurrection of the body of Jesus identified by its marks. Then, nothing could daunt the Apostles. Their vehement assertion of this truth became an irresistible force, which continues to turn the world upside down. "The common people heard Him gladly" (Mark xii. 37). The common people are coming to the top.

What did the disciples mean when they asserted Jesus to be "The Christ"? We are not left in doubt. Andrew said to Peter: "We have found the Messiah, which is, being translated, the Christ" (John i. 41). So said the woman of Samaria: "When Messiah comes, who is called Christ" (John iv. 25). The meaning of both the Hebrew and Greek words was generally known, and there was no confusion of Person. Jesus was to them

"The Christ" of the Old Testament, as Zacharias in Luke (i. 69, 70), Peter in Acts (iii. 18), Paul in Romans (i. 2), proclaimed, according to the teaching of Jesus Himself (Luke xxiv. 27), that all the prophets had spoken of Jesus Christ since the world began.

Who then is "The Christ" of the Old Testament? In the Old Testament "Jehovah" is the expression and manifestation of the Godhead as a Person in contact with men, exactly as Jesus is the expression and manifestation of God to men in the New Testament. The Hebrew "*Adonai*" and the Greek "*Kurios*" were each translated "Lord" in our English version to maintain this connection. The Revised Version hesitated to alter this. It was a timid device and has not succeeded. Jehovah and Jesus are widely separated in modern thought, although correctly united by the children of Jerusalem (Mark xi. 9, 10). This obscuration of language is not of men. There is a veil over spiritual things, lest men eat of the Tree of Life and believe without change of heart. Therefore, the demand by unbelieving Jewish dignitaries for a sign was not conceded.

The Gospel of "The Christ" was in the

beginning. What beginning? There was no difficulty about Creation—that did not challenge—that magnified—the wisdom of God until it came to creating man. Then, there was consultation. Man would use his free will, not to obey, but to rebel; not to love, but to hate. In that Council, we hear Christ speaking: "Lo, I come to do Thy Will, O God" (Ps. xl. 7, 8). The Son of God was anointed to win men back to believe in the Love of God toward them and to love God in return. The fulfilment of free will is voluntary love. God found a friend in Abraham; Jesus Christ loved John. For this interchange of perfect love man was created in the image of God. Therefore, Jesus said to Peter: "Lovest thou Me?" (John xxi. 17). Therefore, the fulfilment of the Law is Love—Love God and love our neighbour (Matt. xxii. 37–39). Are we any nearer the goal? I think we are.

For what reason? Because, in that Council the triune Godhead sat down together and counted the cost. As Peter (1 Peter i. 19, 20), and John (Rev. xiii. 8) have both emphatically stated, "The Christ" was reckoned as slain "before the foundation of

the world." It was at that far-distant date that He "made Himself of no reputation" and consented to be "made in the likeness of men," "obedient unto death" (Phil. ii. 7, 8). This "humbling" shook the angelic hosts. Its rejection scattered the Jews over the face of the earth with the mark of Cain on their race. Its denial has pulverised the Germanic Empire and produced a generation which, to use Rudyard Kipling's scathing phrase (*Irish Guards*), "lovingly" carried out a destruction which has shocked mankind. Its questioning has broken gaps in God's hedge about us. Our sea-girt isle no longer protects us from the air: for the first time we are a people in debt. When the Gospel puts nations into the crucible they have a very poor time. That "humbling" will prevail because of its nobility.

I am not downhearted. In our prosperity we sent the Gospel in all languages over the whole earth, and in our worst days we have not withheld our hand. The faith of the believing few is the shield of our Empire and will yet produce, by believing prayer, peace on earth. For the circulation of God's Word is ploughing up the stagnant minds

of common men and is opening their eyes to see the horrors produced by a civilisation, or by a heathenism, based upon human greed and selfishness. This experience of the power of the Bible to substitute goodwill for hate in men of all colours, creeds and cultures is quietly strengthening the faith of all mankind that Jesus is binding strong men and will spoil their policy of all that makes for oppression and aggression. The goal is nearer—whether by League of Nations, International Court, Conferences, the voices of our great Dominions, or other means of better organising the public opinion of the common people, echoing the Sermon on the Mount.

Here may I ask, What does it profit us to weaken the authority of the Bible in the eyes of our children? What have you, suggesters of doubts, got to give them in place of the Bible? If the Old Testament is untrustworthy, then "The Christ" has no existence and Jesus had no authority. All authority is shaken. Where is your standard of right and wrong? If the Ten Commandments be discarded, so must be the Two of our Lord, because the content and the authority of the Two are derived from the Ten.

Men are beginning to question what we have benefited by excluding Bible teaching from our schools; by being ashamed of Jesus Christ in India and Egypt. As Sir Valentine Chirol (*Times*, May 14, 1923) is reported to have said the other day: "A tragedy of the British connection with India was the deliberate exclusion of religion from its educational system. This caused the Hindu to consider Western civilisation as chiefly a material influence." In other words, we offered the Hindu, as we are offering our own children, the husk instead of the kernel of knowledge. We are teaching boys and girls to know the evil lurking in their own minds—instead of teaching them to know God.

Further, in recent years we have been excavating the religions and practices of old-time wickedness. Our girls are becoming as well acquainted as our boys with the abominations of past and destroyed generations, against which the whole artillery of the Prophets, afterwards supported by the Apostles, unceasingly thundered. The buttress of the Old Testament teaching has been knocked away. The moral sense is dulled. Hence the divorce courts are thronged

and the newspapers by their reports are corrupting the world. For British example is the strongest factor in the world.

Our faith sorely needed testing. We are losing sight of spiritual things. In wedlock, we do not see that God has joined us together. Our work is not done to Christ as our Master. We have lost the joy of companionship with Jesus Christ on Sunday. The future of Elisha depended upon his ability to see the chariot and horses of fire which separated him from Elijah. It is an awful fact that wonders may happen and we lose the blessing because we do not see them. As used to be the case with the rivers of India, we are allowing our vast spiritual resources to run to waste.

Belief is a vitalising power. It gives permanency to a life. Abraham's belief in the Word of God, tried in the crucible of God's testing, produced a like faith in succeeding generations, and it is active to-day. All the Prophets, because they believed, share this enduring vitality and life-giving influence. To them it mattered not that destroying armies swept over the promised land and cast out the chosen people. Their faith saw the

Saviour—a vision of death and glory, a crucified and triumphant conqueror. They stood firm amid disasters such as we have not experienced. It seems odd that the most signal victory ever bestowed upon our arms should shake our faith in God. Our accumulated riches have gone. Was wealth the rock of our confidence?

Are our children taught Christianity? There are three stepping-stones by which faith crossed the ages; so firmly set, that upon them Christianity rests. They are the promise made to Eve, repeated to Abraham, confirmed to David. Each promise was given on a momentous occasion: at the beginning of the human race; at the founding of the Jewish people; at the establishment of the throne and house of David. The promise of an everlasting throne filled David with such overwhelming wonder that he strengthened his belief in it by turning the promise into a prayer. Each of the promises was accompanied by such impressive majesty, that each was handed on to succeeding generations and each formed the pathway to the next, till they became household words in Jerusalem and burst from the lips

of children and beggars when Jesus fulfilled them.

There were poor folk who reasoned: "If this man were not of God, He could do nothing" (John ix. 33), who cried: "Son of David" (Mark x. 48); "Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of Jehovah" (Mark xi. 9, 10). These despised folk saw Jehovah in Jesus. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." They had spiritual sight.

The reason of the intellectuals is not receptive. To their blindness, anthropomorphical concepts degrade the Almighty—a man cannot be God—which means that God made man and despised His work. On the contrary, Christ stood at the door of Cain's heart and knocked—pleading—"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" from the beginning. We have six thousand years of Christian experience.

The Crucifixion was really a rock upon which faith could rest. "Ought not Christ to have suffered?" (Luke xxiv. 26). But it shook the faith of the Apostles almost to despair. Why? The Crucifixion proved the humanity of Jesus. All men witnessed it. The Resurrection manifested His Godhead,

but no one saw the Risen Jesus outside the circle of faith. These faithful few knew their Old Testament and, as I have said, nothing could withstand their sudden experience of its truth. Peter to the Jews and Paul to the Gentiles preached "The Christ crucified" (1 Cor. i. 23).

After nineteen centuries' experience of the life-giving power of this Gospel, why is the bulk of our population beginning to doubt the great verities of Christianity? The answer is, because Christ stands upon the Old Testament and by present-day teaching only the man Jesus is left. The Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the Ascension are unreasonable. To the Greeks, the intellectuals, foolishness.

Among the causes which have brought about in the present generation a declining belief in the Old Testament, Bishop Gore, in his book *Belief in God*, mentions, as by far the most important, what may be briefly labelled Darwinian Evolution and Higher Criticism. The former is supposed to have turned the flank of Genesis. The latter is a frontal attack upon salient points along the whole line.

The theory of Evolution is in the crucible of science, and I have only time to invite your attention to one point. The waters brought forth fish and fowl; the earth produced plants and animals. Man was the separate creation of God, introduced by the words, "And God said," which notify each stage in creation. God did not create man a monkey and leave the creature to flounder its way through several million years from obedience to animal instincts to a divine moral consciousness. "God so loved the world" that He was daily with Adam and Eve till they rejected Him. Further, man received life in a different way. Man was not left to suppose that he was made of different material from the rest of creation; or that his life differed from other life. The same words are used for both man and animals. The important distinction remains. Man was made separately by God and breath and life were "breathed" into him by God, which is not said of any other creature. The distinction was always understood. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Eccl. xii. 7).

Life and breath are not used in connection with the vegetable kingdom, but great stress is laid on "seed" and "after its kind." We are informed that God made every plant before it grew; from which we may conclude that plants grew from seed. Paul takes this view when he writes (1 Cor. xv. 38), "God gave to every seed its own body"; that is, imposed in every seed the plant it must produce.

To these facts, all theories of science, as knowledge increases, will be constrained to conform. Meanwhile, when you must choose between science and Scripture, prefer the Bible—but do not cramp the sweep of its meaning within the narrow sense of an English word.

The chief plank of Higher Criticism is a mistaken explanation of the use of the Name of God. Like the Persons of the Trinity, the Name is complex. The introduction of "Lord God," that is, "Jehovah Elohim," in the second and third chapters of Genesis, suggested a means to confound the identity of God by dividing the Old Testament against itself, pitting Elohim against Jehovah. Now that we are beginning to understand the splendour of the Court in which Moses grew

up, and how little its furniture and art differed from what we produce to-day, the Egyptian colouring in the Pentateuch is becoming evident, and the Babylonian theory will yield to common sense. A late date for the Pentateuch seems to me impossible. I will mention only one line of thought.

Abraham's servant directed his prayer with care: "O Jehovah God of my master Abraham" (Gen. xxiv. 12). Elijah upon Mount Carmel, when he wrestled to retrieve Israel from idolatry, used these words: "Hear me, O Jehovah, hear me, that this people may know that Thou art Jehovah God" (1 Kings xviii. 37). Elisha, as he stood by Jordan, cried: "Where is Jehovah God of Elijah?" (2 Kings ii. 14). All three occasions were supreme moments in the lives of these men, and, in their prayers, when everything depended upon the result, all three men went back to the foundation Name, Jehovah-Elohim, in Genesis. In each case the answer was immediate and dramatic.

This significant Name passes into the New Testament. The Angel Gabriel said to the Virgin Mary: "The Lord God (*i. e.* Jehovah-God) shall give unto Him the throne of His

father David" (Luke i. 32). Zacharias, filled with the Holy Ghost, said: "Blessed be the Lord God (*i. e.* Jehovah-God) of Israel" (Luke i. 68). And the angels to the shepherds link this with Jesus: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord" (Luke ii. 11)—*i. e.* Christ-Jehovah. Therefore, when the Wise Men inquired for Jesus, who had been born King of the Jews, Herod demanded where "the Christ" should be born. There is identity between Jehovah-God and Jesus "the Christ."

Immense pains are taken in the Bible to identify God. Many people of all races throughout the centuries have prayed, and are still praying, but their prayers were misdirected and were either returned through the dead prayer office or brought trouble. It is of importance to know to whom we pray. Many touched Jesus and got nothing. Their faith did not touch "The Christ."

When Israel rejected Jehovah, they lost the Presence of "the Christ" for a season: "I will not go up in the midst of thee." To make the withdrawal plain to Israel, Moses took the tabernacle and pitched it outside

the camp. No angel could impart spiritual life, and Moses interceded with agony and secured the return of Christ. "My Presence shall go with thee" (Exod. xxxiii. 3, 7, 14). We are approaching a similar crisis. In the proportion that we lose "the Christ"—Jehovah of the Old Testament—from our concept of the majestic Person of Jesus, the Holy Spirit will depart from us. No longer will Jehovah Christ stand in our midst to give our land rest within and without and through us to bless the nations with peace and equity.

There is everything to strengthen Christian experience of the Love of God. Europe may be a seething cauldron of hatreds, yet the universal longing for Peace is forming an international public opinion—not for a peace at any price—there is unprecedented effort to establish Right, to treat African races fairly, to suppress traffic in white slaves, opium, drugs—and why not alcohol? Is it noble or friendly to line up America's territorial waters with British liquor-laden ships? Nor is the yearning only towards welfare. Powerful native Churches are appearing in China, India, Africa, and even statesmen see

that in the growth of these spiritual influences lies the hope of the future. Above all, there is the insatiable craving for the Bible. Why is it that the Bible to-day is the most saleable book in the world? The Bible is thrown into the crucible of each generation and comes out the same living, life-giving Book.

Lastly, Christian experience has recently received startling evidence, in the deliverance of the Holy Land, in the movement to restore the Jews, and in the fierce opposition thereby aroused, that the Old Testament is moving towards great events.

In the physical cosmos there is no such thing as chance—no accidental variations through a million years nor variations by kangaroo-jumps—science will discover that the dartings of gaseous atoms are as subject to law as the weights of the stars. Not a sparrow falls but with due regard to the administration of creation. Nothing can befall the child of God by chance. But we have a choice. We may strip the Lord Jesus of His royal robes and be ground to powder ourselves, or we can crown Jesus Christ King of Nations, Jehovah of Hosts, the King of Glory, and lead the world into peace.

II. THE TEST OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

By the Rev. Norman Maclean, D.D.

THE subject of the test of Christian Unity is the most vital question for the Church at the present moment. The world is in a sad and sorry plight. We are presented with the spectacle of divided nations, races and classes, a spectacle which might make anybody wince. Where are we to find an instrument with which to save the world from its woe? A riven and divided Church can never unite a riven and divided humanity. The first step to achieve anything is to create a weapon with which to fight the enemies of God and which will build up His kingdom; and only a Church united into solidity can do that.

As we think of how to build up the Church of the future, after which our hearts pant and cry, we have to ask ourselves, What road are we to travel toward that end? There are several roads which humanity has hitherto tried and on which it has failed.

I would like to indicate to you three of these roads along which we cannot hope to arrive at union. The first road is the road of credal beliefs. There are some people who would like to build up a Church in which everybody believed the same things. That is absolutely impossible. I have no faith whatever in uniformity of standards or of doctrines. I do not think that there is very great difference between the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England—scarcely any difference whatever. And they are at one in this: that they are both singularly unlovable and singularly undesirable. I cannot imagine any human being ever being brought to the feet of Christ by perusing either the Westminster Confession or the Thirty-Nine Articles. You cannot possibly have a unity based upon unity of dogma, for this reason—that you cannot rear a Church upon that which is imperfect. So far as one can see, doctrine is imperfect. We have not yet attained to the fullness of knowledge. The promise of the Holy Spirit is that He will "guide into all the truth." That goal is not yet in sight. Doctrine must inevitably

be imperfect at the present stage of imperfect knowledge. Therefore it is hopeless to think that in a world of flux and change you are going to rear a Church upon unity of doctrine.

A further barrier on this road is that Christianity is not intellectual gymnastics. When you set men to draw up a statement of belief, at once it is the brain that is called into play, and, of all things, I doubt the *brain*. For this reason. Whenever you see a man who lives what is a so-called intellectual life, that man is a man who cannot help being inspired by a sense of intellectual arrogance. Just because Christianity is not intellectualism—and the longer I live the more I doubt the value of that sort of intellectualism, for the progress of knowledge is progress into the realisation of the fact that we know nothing—seeing that Christianity is not intellectualism, and seeing that truth has not yet been attained, therefore the basis of the future unity of the Church cannot lie in a unity of creed. We dismiss that road, therefore.

The second road along which men have tried to attain the unity of the Church is the road of a common theory of Church govern-

ment. Of course, I know that here I am approaching a very delicate subject, and I do not exactly feel like Daniel in the den of lions. I rather feel like a poor belaboured lion in a den of Daniels! But let us examine this. Are we to attain unity along the road of a uniformity of Church government? Again I say I have great doubt and hesitation about that. For this reason. Church government, of course, is based upon a theory of Church Orders. I would like you to remember that it is not a theory of Church Orders, or the fact of Church Orders, that created the Church. It is the Church that created these things; and if it be a fact that the Church created these things, then these things are not of the essence of that unity after which we seek. After all, do not let us commit the singular blunder of trying to argue for a unity of the Church based upon a theory; for the doctrines about Church Orders are but theory.

What was it that produced Orders? I rather think myself that what produced the Orders was this. The early Christian Church felt that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was so great and so holy a thing that it could

not be left to the chance of an ordinary worshipper administering it. And as the great doctrine of the Real Presence grew in the Church, and the Holy Sacrament became the Mass, naturally, inevitably a special class had to come into existence for the ministry of the altar. Remember that the Mass is the soul of Orders, and personally I do feel what a great thing it is—that doctrine—that there you can feel yourself in the very presence of God. It is the very power, the very heart of Roman Catholicism.

But what did we do—these Western Churches of ours—in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? We abolished the Mass. There are some singularly strong words used in the Prayer Book regarding the Mass. The soul of Orders is therefore gone, the thing which brought Orders into existence is gone, and you have nothing left but a theory.

I want you to remember also that the Latin Church and the Greek Church never dream of basing the Church upon any theory of Orders. Nothing is more alien to the mind of the Latin and the Greek than such a fact. If that be so, why then do we lay such singular

emphasis upon Orders? To make a theory of Orders the test of unity is to apply a test alien to the Roman Catholic Church and alien to the Greek Church, and, I humbly submit, alien to the very spirit of Him who never prescribed for His followers any Order of government, and who would have prescribed such an Order if it were the essence of His Faith and of His Church.

The next road along which people have tried to attain Church unity is the road of common worship. Again, I humbly submit, that is a road which will lead us nowhere, and which rightly will lead us nowhere. It is not by bringing the whole Christian Church into a uniformity of worship, but rather by getting every individual and separate Church to bring its riches into the common storehouse—only along that road can you attain a unity desirable and worth having. I have worshipped with Christians of every kind. I have worshipped in bare little Scottish churches and in great cathedrals, in conventicles in the Highlands and on the moors. But everywhere I worshipped I found that people worshipped in sincerity and in truth, however diverse their forms.

Only the other day I found myself in the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem, at a service which is called the Service of the Holy Fire, and as I watched the seething, contending mass of humanity waiting for the fire from heaven, and as I saw at last the lighted torch coming out of the Holy Sepulchre, I said to myself, "This is the most sacrilegious service I ever witnessed." But I saw near me a pilgrim woman with the tears streaming down her cheeks, kneeling down on the floor as she got her taper lighted, and I realised that there, even there, were Christians worshipping in sincerity and in truth. The Lord Jesus Christ never prescribed for His Church after what form or Order they were to worship. He only prescribed for them this test: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." The sooner we begin to realise that the things which separate us from our fellow-Christians are of no importance, the more rapidly will we advance toward the goal of unity. The greatest crimes in the history of the Church have sprung from this: the attempt to realise unity by imposing uniformity of rites and worship.

If along these roads be not the test of unity, what is it? I suggest to you that if you want to realise the real test of Church unity, you have to go back to the New Testament. I submit to you that surely the men who lived in the after-glow of the Crucifixion, and of the Resurrection of our Lord; that the men who knew Him, the men on whom His Spirit came on the day of Pentecost —we may surely take their words as to what the test which separates the Christian from the non-Christian is. What was their test? "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His"; "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." That is the only test of Christian unity worth considering. Every man and woman who has got the spirit of Christ—that is, the spirit of love, and self-sacrifice, and meekness, and humility—they are the members of the Church, Holy and Catholic. "Wherever," said a Scottish Covenanter, "there are three poor people praying behind a dyke, there is the Church."

But we must not for one moment think that, having attained to that, we can go on acquiescing in the present condition of Chris-

tendom. Because we cannot. I said the test is, "If a man have the spirit of Christ," and that spirit is the spirit of love. If that be so, this follows: that love is bound to pull down every wall of separation segregating him from the people he loves. He cannot abide in his conventicle, shut in and debarred from his fellow Christians. The spirit of love is inevitably the spirit of unity. Love inevitably must set itself to sap and undermine every barrier which impedes fellowship with the hearts beloved. In so far as the spirit of love is in the heart, in that same measure will there be a passion burning in the soul to make an end of every wall of separation which is impeding and hindering the fellowship and the unity of the Church of Christ.

I think the cheering thing about the day in which we live is this: that we see, more or less, Christians realising that—Christians setting themselves slowly but steadily to break down the walls of isolation.

You remember the thrill which was caused by the Lambeth proposals. That thrill has unfortunately passed because the extravagant and excited expectations have been found to be illusive. I for one never had any extrava-

gant or excited expectations regarding them. If you will allow me to strike a note of criticism, I would just like to explain to you how the Lambeth proposals did not come up to my test of Christian unity. You find in these proposals this extraordinarily beautiful statement: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body." No finer statement could be put into the English language than that. All who have been baptised into the Holy Trinity are members of the Universal Church. I should have preferred the word *Catholic* to *Universal* myself. But just listen as to how they work it out. Though they acknowledge that I am a member of the Catholic Church, yet they declare that to admit me to the Sacrament in an Anglican church is an "irregularity." Just mark the word. And that "irregularity" must cease after a certain time. These are mutually destructive things. If I am a member of the Holy Catholic Church, then going to the Holy Sacrament in any church cannot be an irregularity.

But a second extraordinary thing about these proposals is this. They say, in very beautiful language, that God wills fellowship. I remember the glow which came round my heart when I read these words. Then they go on to explain how, in a future union of the Church which they hope to see arise from these proposals—how a minister who entered it without being re-ordained—how such a minister would not be allowed to speak in any other church except his own, unless he was "licensed thereto by the Bishop."

I do not know anything about England, but I can assure you that in Scotland these conditioning clauses put those proposals out of practical politics. Not even the most vivid imagination in this hall could imagine the minister of St. Giles' Cathedral asking a licence from any Bishop to preach in another church in Scotland. The test of unity is, I have said, the spirit of Christ, the spirit of love, love of the brethren, and when the Church sets herself to realise that, the only way along which she can do so is to speak with one voice, and not with two voices. Love is fellowship and love is mutual service, and to talk of Church union and love and fellowship,

and yet use the word "irregularity" about communicants—well, that does far more harm than good.

One last word. I would like to see the Churches adopt a self-denying ordinance, by which they would bind themselves for the space of five years to stop talking about Church union; and I would like to see all Conferences on Church union come to an end—I hope the Secretary will forgive me—and that, in place of this weary drip of talk, we set ourselves to show each other by gracious deeds of love that the spirit of Christ is in our hearts. It is only by such gracious deeds, by sharing mutual service, by welcoming one another to the common Communion Table, by standing shoulder to shoulder together against every inrush of wickedness and insincerity—only so shall we give free course to the Holy Spirit of God. The next essential step towards Church union is not talk. The next step is deeds, and if it be impossible for us to worship together or commemorate our Lord together at His Table, why, then, let us resign ourselves to the spectacle, which is our condemnation, the spectacle of a riven and a divided Church unable to bring any healing

to a riven and divided world, because there is not found in it that spirit of love which can work out its own unity, its own salvation, by acts of love and of service!

In the seventeenth century, in Scotland, that Scotsman who was the finest and purest soul that ever tabernacled in Scottish clay—Archbishop Leighton—spoke of the times in which he lived in this manner: "The body of religion is torn and bleeding, its soul is dying, while we are fighting about the hem of its garment!" There are times when to fight is dignified; but to see the body of religion torn and bleeding, and its soul dying, and go on talking—that is the depth of all humiliation.

III. THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

By Dr. Douglas Adam

THE challenge of the future comes to us from our Lord Jesus Christ, who has the programme of the future in His right hand; the challenge also comes from the world. The resources with which to meet the challenge of the future are ours in Christ. He is here now with His own programme, by His Holy Spirit, so that the pressures of the eternal world are upon us. We need not seek for the coming of the Holy Ghost. He is here. The pressure of the Divine Spirit waits upon our obedience to carry out the message, the life, and the power of Jesus Christ. The world also waits that we should answer its challenge. The world seeks from the Christian Church a revaluation of values. It knows that its values are wrong, and does not know how to correct them. I asked one of the most brilliant professors of sociology in an American university, a while ago, what he

thought was the supreme need in the social outlook of the world, and he said, "A revaluation of values." I answered, "I quite agree; but what is your standard of revaluation?" He said, "That is difficult; I do not know." But we do know, and that is where the Church of Christ has its message to the world. If you have been to Edinburgh, you have probably heard the gun fire at one o'clock, and have seen people adjusting their watches by the time which has come from the Observatory on the Calton Hill by an electric connection, as I understand it, with Edinburgh Castle. Thus men get the exact time from the Observatory, and not from the town clock. To-day the world's clock is wrong, and the world knows it. It has no direct contact with the unseen, and it appeals to those who have the contact to give her the time—not from Big Ben, but from the Observatory in which those who know God in Christ live.

But you say, "Yes, Christian people who talk like that always talk in the air. Be concrete." And I shall endeavour to be concrete. The world seeks a revaluation of values, first of all, in the direction of knowing what the secret of satisfaction is. The world

does not know. Every life, apart from God, tends to find its satisfaction in material things. And you know that seeking satisfaction in material things grows upon one, so that one must have more and more material things by which to satisfy the spirit. In seeking more material things for satisfaction, one's own life deteriorates, so that one asks more than one is able to give. That is not only the spiritual but the economic crisis in which we stand at this moment—a purely worldly life insisting upon material things, deteriorating in the process, unable to produce the equivalent of what it consumes. That is the condition toward which, without God and without the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the world is driven.

But a Christian who has definite Christian experience knows that in Christ his supreme satisfaction is solved from within. "He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." That is to say, a Christian has the secret of satisfaction. We know that in an hour a man's physical cravings can be changed by a spiritual change in his life. We know

that one who really lives with Christ is not nearly so critical, even at the breakfast-table. The point is that that inner satisfaction enables the individual not only to be satisfied, but to give to society an increasing economic efficiency as well as a spiritual efficiency. A person who is living in the Spirit for his supreme satisfaction—that person is not only demanding less from society, but he has such an increased capacity for achievement that he gives more and asks less; which is spiritual and economic soundness. That is the need. It is that a larger number of people shall find their satisfaction in the things of the Spirit, who are continually asking less and giving more, because they have found the secret of satisfaction. This whole question of the revival of religion has not only a spiritual implication; it has a vast, far-reaching economic implication. No man can be a student of economics without realising this, if he think deeply enough as to what economics really are.

My next point is, that the world is seeking a revaluation of values in the direction of the meaning of success. The challenge of the future is for the Church to interpret

to the world what is success. It is folly to talk about theories of social order unless you have valuations that will answer them. The idea to-day is that success is *getting something*. When a man considers the question whether his life has been successful, he asks instinctively, "What has come my way?" That is the general apprehension of the meaning of success—either money, or position, or fame, or pleasure, or what not; something which has come to him. We cannot blame our young people for having that ideal of success when we ourselves bow down to those ideals. When Christians recognise that which we know is not true success, what is the use of talking about correcting the ideals of the world? "Judgment must begin at the house of God." If success is primarily *getting*, then there is no kind of hope of anything like social equilibrium. I do not care what theory of social order you have—behind that theory there is failure in an ideal of success which is primarily *getting*, and not *giving*. Success is not the wine drunk, but the wine poured forth. Our Lord says, "He that loveth his life shall lose it, but he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it."

Christians must revaluate success at the Cross where He gave His life, a ransom for many; at the Cross where the darkness fell upon Him, where He was forsaken and died. That is our valuation of success. But is it true that we valuate success at the Cross? Let us face the question. Do we really carry that out in our Church life? Or are we still worshippers of bulk, and bigness, of name, instead of reality? How can we change the ideal of the world until we change our own?

But you say, "You are talking unpractically. We must live. One cannot think merely of service in a world of practical facts where one must get one's living." I remember asking the president of one of the largest Insurance Companies in America, "Have you places for young men?" "Yes, I have places for young men near the top. That is the place which I find most difficult to fill in this office with its hundreds of clerks." 'How is that?" "Well, the difficulty is to find people interested enough in this business to keep their eyes off the clock at four. I have some places for men who are passionately concerned for the interests of this Company." That is to say, real success

is a by-product of efficiency and self-forgetting effort. Every great thing that comes to us is a by-product of self-forgetting service.

Again, the world seeks a revaluation of values in regard to democracy. One hears a great deal of criticism of democracy—that it is a failure. For myself democracy is the most ascendant idea in the modern world. Democracy has a right to survive because it has a great spiritual ancestry. But many men to-day are in danger of simply looking at democracy as to its fruit, not to its root. The great democrat was our Lord Jesus Christ, who was beyond class and race and every other limitation. Jesus Christ was the great democrat because He brought the spirit of democracy into all His relations and inspired it in others. Exclusiveness is not the besetting sin of one class; exclusiveness is a tendency in human nature. You have noticed one class criticising exclusiveness in another class, and practising it in its own. But Christ in His democracy proclaims the genuine spirit of brotherhood; and if the Church is to take up the challenge of the future and answer the need of the world, she must keep before it the fact that democracy has a

spiritual root as well as material fruit. One is surprised to find those who ought to know better searching for the material fruits of democracy, forgetting that its root is spiritual. No democracy can survive unless its roots are spiritual. The basis of democracy is Theocracy.

A supreme tendency in modern democracy is to emphasise rights rather than obligations. Jesus, the great democrat, emphasised, first, obligations, and then rights. We have it inverted to-day, and that is the peril of our civilisation—the perpetual emphasis upon rights to the neglect of obligations. No man can have rights who forgets his obligations. I have no rights if I have no obligations. How often I have tried to emphasise that fact to University students in America. You can only establish your rights when you recognise firmly and sincerely your obligations. Look at Russia. There you have the attempt to establish rights without any adequate recognition of obligation. Christ seeks that His disciples, having the experience of His life in their souls, shall interpret democracy to men. That is a spiritual union with Him and a perpetual recognition of our obligations to God

and our fellow-men, as well as of our individual rights. Such is the message which democracy needs at this moment—to be delivered from the grip of selfishness, that the Church shall rescue it and bring back democracy to where it belongs—at the feet of Jesus.

Was it not true, in the days of the ancient Greeks, that men who refused, first, to recognise their obligations were called "idiotes"? That is not the meaning of the word as it is recognised to-day; it is the other way about. It is the one who recognises obligations first who often is looked upon in the light of the meaning of that word.

The world seeks a revaluation of values in regard to *the extent* of relationships. How far shall we be related to the world in which we live? Shall we share with the lower animals an interest in our family, or in our community, or in our country? The tragic events of past years have shown us that we cannot live provincially. Not that we shall be less patriotic, but our patriotism must go further than nationality. This is not anything new. It is quite true that in recent times science and invention have made the world a superficial unit. The penny post, the newspaper, the

telegraph, wireless, the train, the steamboat, international law, jurisprudence, diplomacy, international finance, have bound the world superficially into a unit. But our Lord recognised that long ago when He said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to all nations." Christ was the first and the only cosmopolitan who ever lived on this planet. Foreign missions in the Church are the expression of the cosmopolitanism of Jesus and of the recognition of the solidarity of the world. But there must be an approach to a recognition of the solidarity of the world in international life. We cannot leave any out. What foreign missions are in the Church —you may not agree with me at all, I am expressing simply my own opinion—what foreign missions are in the Church, the League of Nations must be in the life of the world. The League of Nations is not a political question, it is fundamentally religious. It is based upon the cosmopolitanism of Jesus. We must inspire the idea with religious conviction rather than with mere political utility. It is a question which lies at the very heart of our world's life, that Christ claims the world for Himself and for His spirit, and the

Church must have an outlook which makes terminal connections with social reality.

This is the challenge of the future, as it seems to me, and the Lord Jesus Christ is here as the inspirer of it. He has His programme in His own hand, and He works through Christian experience. We must have something to unite. What we need more and more is a richer, and deeper, and larger spiritual experience of our Lord, a more widely extended consciousness of His personal sovereignty and power, and to articulate to the world the values of Christ.

THE MENACE TO THE GOSPEL

I. THE MODERNIST ERROR [1]

By the late Rt. Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield (Bishop of Chelmsford)

THE Menace to the Gospel: The Modernist Error, The Sectarian Error, The Romanist Error. What is the spirit in which we are to meet and combat these undoubted errors? You hear a Labour man speaking of the menace of Capitalism, and using language very often of a certain type denouncing capitalists. On the other hand, you hear in the House of Commons somebody speaking of the menace of Socialism. Again, he uses language of a certain type and in a certain spirit. We are beginning to discover the menace of Modernism and Sectarianism and Romanism. How are we to approach it? Are we to approach it in the spirit of the two Members of Parliament I have just referred to? Is that to be our action? Are we to approach it in language of denunciation scarcely distinguishable in character from

[1] Abridged, and not revised by the Speaker.

that sometimes heard on political platforms?

I venture to think that to-day we want a different kind of atmosphere than that often found at political meetings when we begin to discuss questions of this kind.

May I just add one personal word quite sincere and honest? I suppose it has been given to very few men to travel throughout the world as I have done, and to mix with men and women of almost every type of religion upon the face of the earth. And after listening to this and to that, and after reading this and that, I honestly feel—with regard to the whole evangelical foundation principles—the ones that are nearest the teaching of my Lord and the teaching of the New Testament—I think I can honestly say that in my own belief I am a more pronounced and strong Evangelical, with all that that great word means, than I ever have been during my life. But the closer I look into the heart of my Divine Lord the larger I find it to be. It is a big heart, is the heart of Christ, something that far transcends the merely human heart.

As I read history, especially Church history

all down the ages, what do I find? Alas! that it should be so. Such a different spirit from the Master's is found in many of His disciples. The Apostles, I often think, must have been married men with large families. Their descendants must have early distributed themselves throughout the whole Christian Church; for the characteristics which we find in the disciples mentioned in the Gospels are, alas! often found among the disciples of all the Churches. "Master, here is this village in Samaria. Think of what they are saying, think of what they are teaching. Call down fire from heaven and consume them!" But the Master did not. "Master, there is a man casting out devils, and he is actually not following us. Forbid him!" But the Master did not forbid him. "Send her away; she crieth after us!" The Master did not send her away. He actually had a Judas and a Peter at the Holy Communion. I wonder whether we have ever weighed that up and tried to think it out? What an extraordinary thing that our Lord had a Judas and a Peter at the Holy Communion! And He knew exactly what was going to happen to both of them.

The more I read the four Gospels the more I find that our Lord had a tremendous sympathy with everybody. He might say this person is wrong and that person is wrong, but He showed sympathy with everybody—even with the woman taken actually in adultery—excepting two classes of people, and those two classes of people our Lord seems to treat differently from any others. Who were they? The hypocrites and the intolerant people. For those He has nothing but "Woe!" "Woe!" "Woe!" "He would not break the broken reed, He would not quench the smoking flax." I cannot find anywhere a real denunciation of an imperfect believer. "The grain of mustard seed." Has the Modernist got the grain of mustard seed? Do not try to crush it. It may spring up to be the greatest of all trees. Has the Roman Catholic got the grain of faith? Even, like the mustard seed, remember, it may spring up. Has the Sectarian got faith even as a grain of mustard seed, so small that you can hardly see it? Yet it is something that the Master recognises. I say that first of all, because I want us, not merely to-night but all the time, to try to get the Master's spirit

rather than the spirit of the disciples all down the ages. We have got to deal with these errors, but we must deal with them in a certain kind of way—in the Master's way and with the Master's spirit.

I have been asked to speak more especially upon the Modernist Error. It is not very easy to do that. I will tell you why. We know the position of the Evangelical—personal religion, personal devotion to Christ, personal faith in the Atoning work upon the Cross. We can describe the Evangelical pretty clearly and accurately. We can describe fairly easily the Catholic position. It adheres more or less to the corporate tradition of the ages, it believes in institutional and sacramental religion. We can easily define those two.

But when it comes to the Modernist it is a very difficult matter. Because the Modernist takes his stand upon this: what his own reason and conscience can teach him. He makes that his final appeal, his authority. You see, from the very nature of the case, that this will allow of almost all kinds of conceivable variations. You may have a man holding the wildest and most dangerous

doctrines, down to the most trivial and most harmless deviations from the truth. So that it is not quite easy to deal with this question.

It has led to much misconception. But you must distinguish between the legitimate Higher Critic and the Modernist. The two are not necessarily identical. They may be even so far apart as to be actually fighting one against the other. This was recognised at the Reformation. The Reformation in my opinion was the greatest event since the days of Pentecost; and the most important factor, in a way, was the restoration of the Bible as the supreme authority on all matters of faith. In other words, the Bible took the place which the Church occupied for centuries before the Reformation. You can easily see that, when the Bible was restored to its rightful place, it might lead to all kinds of views about the Bible. Sometimes our friends who speak, and rightly speak, of the Reformation as having placed the Bible in supreme authority, forget that many of the Reformers adhered to views scarcely distinguishable from the views of Higher Critics of to-day.

Men say that Higher Criticism leads on to Modernism. It may do; sometimes it does.

But it does not necessarily undermine or destroy the essential faith; because the man who said all this wrote, in my own opinion, one of the greatest Evangelical books in the world, "The Epistle to the Galatians." Yet, if Luther lived to-day you would place him among the Higher Critics. Sometimes our friends do not grasp the position. Protestantism is freedom—freedom to criticise, freedom to investigate. The Bible can stand it. Sometimes some of our friends speak as if the Bible cannot stand it. The Bible does not need my defence, or yours. Neither need we spend time in defending the Bible when we could be better employed in proclaiming the Truth that it contains. That is the position.

But you say, "What is Modernism?" It is something different. If you want to know what Modernism is, read the report of that conference at Cambridge two years ago. Then you will see what Modernism really is. Even there you find in some of the papers, as the Bishop of Liverpool has well said, something that has much permanent value, real value. But if you read part of that volume what do you find? You find real Modernism. For instance, one writer doubts

whether the Jesus of history was the unique person in whom St. Paul and St. John saw the only begotten Son of God. Another writer tries to identify the living Christ and the Holy Spirit as if they were one and the same. Another writer denies the pre-existence of Christ. Another held that all that was required for membership in the Church was adherence to the statement, "Jesus is Lord," without giving a definition of the word *Lord*. Another said that all that was required for membership in the Church was adherence to the statement, "God was in Christ." He left out the remainder of the text, "reconciling the world unto Himself." Another writer spoke of highly ingenious explanations of the Creed, made in order to retain our position in the Church—a very ambiguous and, if I may say so, dishonest statement. In other words, much of that teaching described Christianity without the Eternal and Divine Son of God. In yet other words, they describe Christianity without the Christ, and all that Christ meant.

As you read that volume, think of three great preachers. Think of Whitefield, think of Wesley, think of Spurgeon. If any of

these three had preached the Gospel as delivered at that Conference at Cambridge, would their lives have been as productive of the salvation of men as they were? Would Wesley and Whitefield and Spurgeon have been instruments of God in changing the lives of tens of thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of men and women, if they had preached a Gospel, as at Cambridge, of non-miraculous Christianity? Christianity without Christ—what is it? That is Modernism. It is deeper, larger than criticism of the Bible; it is the destruction of the Christ of the Gospel, it is the destruction of the Christ of Calvary.

How are we to meet this? As I have already hinted, not by mere denunciation, and not by the denunciation of even those who proclaim it, but by a more clear and definite and persistent proclamation of the Gospel as we understand it from the Evangelical point of view. Just as the sunrise in the heavens dispels the darkness, so the preaching of the "Sun of Righteousness" hanging upon the Cross will dispel error and remove sin.

My point is this. Is it being preached?

Forgive my asking that, but is it? I know and thank God that in a certain number of churches it is being preached. Is it being preached in Evangelical churches? Is it being preached by us? When did you last hear a sermon on the Atonement? Remember that a social gospel can never take the place of the Cross. "We preach Christ, and Him crucified." That is the only solution for the world's ills and the world's sin. It is the only way to remove the errors of Modernism, Sectarianism, and Roman Catholicism. There is no other way. You may argue, argue, argue. How many conversions do you get through argument? How many? I sometimes wonder. In a certain town, whatever you like to name it—say, Timbuctoo—the English Church Union have a meeting. It is crowded and at the close people go out and say, "What a splendid meeting!" and not a single Evangelical is a penny the worse. Then one of the Protestant Societies goes to that town, and people go to that meeting, and they all go away and say, "What a splendid meeting!" and not one single Anglo-Catholic is a penny the worse. I am an Evangelical, and I

believe the way in which we are going to get the world right is not that way, but only through the persistent teaching of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. That is what I want more and more. I feel that I have got such a short time to live, and so many people to preach to, that I have not got time to enter into all these controversial matters in the way some of my friends want me to. I am not going to denounce them if they take the other method. If they feel led to it, they must do it. But my line is that I must go forth in the spirit of my Master, trying to get men to realise the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and believing that if I can do that He will lead them into all truth; and, above all, preaching the Gospel that makes Evangelicals different from any other kind of Christians in the world, different in spirit, kinder, more Samaritan, more like Christ who said, "Come," and never said "Go," except it was, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel," living out the life of Jesus Christ in love.

A few weeks ago a man said to me, "Bishop, you are not a betting man. If you were, I bet you ten to one I would win. If a Christian

man came to work in our workshop, at the end of a fortnight you would not be able to pick him out." I hope it is exaggerated. But is there not a great truth in it? Can we pick out the Christian man? Are we so different from other people? There are two men, one a Christian and one not, and both are irritated by the same thing; one falls into a vile passion, and the other does not. This other has got the Gospel that saves him from temper. Or there are two men of business, and one of them does things that are a little bit shady and tricky, and the other does not.

Modernism, Sectarianism, Romanism—what is the remedy? Jesus Christ. He is the only remedy, in season and out of season. We need to preach Christ not merely by word of mouth, but by our life, letting men see in ourselves the fruits of our redemption, living out our life to the glory of God. Therefore, I close by saying, like the great Apostle, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." If we preach that, and live it, not only shall we be blessed ourselves, but we shall help to bring in the kingdom of God and of His Christ.

II. THE SECTARIAN ERROR

By the Rev. Norman Maclean, D.D.

It was said by a great man—Pascal, I think—that man is at one time the glory and the scandal of the universe. I think the same thing might be said of the Church. It is certainly the glory of the universe, because, whatever we may say about it, we must admit that the Church has in all ages sought to curb barbarity. It has held up the ideal before humanity, it has broken the "bread," and served the "cup," and held up the Crucified. But it is the scandal in that it has allowed itself to be broken into fragments, and it has dissipated its energies and its life in contending often over trifles. The Church survived the persecution of the Pagans. But the Church has been hampered and hindered by the frailties of its own members.

It is very difficult to define what really Sectarianism is. There are two possible ideals of the Christian Church. There is the ideal

held up by Rome, which is more or less the ideal of us all—the ideal of a Universal Church, transcending all nations, uniting them all; a Church whose every member, wherever he may happen to be, will feel at home. At the Reformation another ideal came, and that was, that the Church should be organised on a national basis, that Christendom should be an alliance of National Churches. These are the two ideals, and if you admit a third you have got endless confusion.

According to the first ideal everybody in this hall, including the Chairman, is a Sectarian. According to the second ideal, when I crossed the Border yesterday, I became a Sectarian, because the Church of Scotland to which I belong is the National Church, and no form of Christianity counts for anything in Scotland really except Presbyterianism. And whenever the Bishop goes north of the Border he becomes a Sectarian. Therefore it is very confusing, very difficult to say what is a Sectarian.

But I do think we will arrive at some realisation of what is behind the word when we consider this. What did the Lord Jesus Christ really come on earth to do? I think

we will all agree that He came to do two things. He came to make men one with God, and one with each other. It is only in the measure in which He makes us one with God—only in that measure can we possibly become one with each other. I think that the Sectarian spirit could be defined as that spirit which negates the purpose of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is to bind mankind together in the law of love and in the unity of the Spirit. If we think of it like that we will realise that no evil could be more grievous than the evil which on any pretext whatever breaks up the love and the fellowship of the Christian Church.

What lies at the root of the fact that we have broken up the fellowship and love of the Christian Church? I think, generally, this: that we have mistaken what Christianity really is. Christianity is spirit and Christianity is life; Christianity is bringing to men the very life and the very spirit of God, and, so far as it brings that spirit to them, it communicates to them the life which is eternal. That is really what Christianity is. Christianity makes a great demand that it may fulfil that great end. It says, "You must

surrender yourself, you must be born again of water and of the Spirit." Men have found that very difficult in all ages. It is an awfully difficult thing so to surrender the life to the Lord Jesus Christ, that pride and arrogance and worldliness shall depart from us and we become the tabernacles of the Spirit.

Men found it difficult to surrender the heart. So they adopted another method. They said, "We will surrender the brain," and they set themselves to place definitions in place of that spirit and that life and that surrendered heart which the Lord Jesus Christ demanded. I do not quarrel with any man's definitions. But I do say that when a man defines anything and makes that definition a pretext for breaking up the unity and fellowship of the Christian Church, that man is falling into the Sectarian Error.

Sectarianism has largely come from the effort to intellectualise Christianity. I do not quarrel with anybody's intellect. But I do say that when you try to express the eternal in a formula, and when you attach to that formula tremendous words, such as, "Whosoever does not believe this, without any doubt he shall perish everlastingly"—the most arro-

gant words and the most alien to the spirit of Christ that ever were written by the hand of man—I say, whoever does that has fallen into the spirit of Sectarianism. It is the denial of the very heart of Christianity. This sectarian spirit is found as commonly in Churches that proclaim their catholicity as in Churches that sit lightly by that word. I do not think that Sectarianism has ever flourished so largely as among people who are fond of logic and definitions and metaphysics. I hate the logical mind. Logic is the last refuge of the feeble-minded.

I submit to you that the Sectarian Error is largely an error of metaphysical definitions; it is laying the emphasis upon the wrong thing, it is a denial of the spirit of unity and love.

The second thing I would like to say about it is this. The Sectarian spirit is a spirit which fastens on some non-essential, and makes that non-essential a canon by which everything is decided. No greater calamity has befallen the Church than the non-essentials which have been so greatly magnified by the Sectarian spirit. But when a man says "I believe in Verbal Inspiration," and makes that

the test of the Christian; and insists that everybody must believe that the whale swallowed Jonah, and makes that the test; or when he says that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and makes that the test, then I say that is the Sectarian spirit. That is the failure to realise that religion is a glorious process of evolution; that religion is not a stagnant pool, but a river deepening and broadening with the centuries, as man grows in the realisation of the greatness and splendour of God.

You remember what Oliver Cromwell said to the Scots when he came north. I always have great respect for Oliver Cromwell, because he was the only man who ever conquered the Scots. You always respect the man who gives you a licking. He came north and conquered Scotland, and he was right. The poor Scots were fighting for Charles II. Think of that! You remember the letter he wrote just before the battle of Dunbar. He wrote the Scots a letter, and he said: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, to believe it possible that you may be mistaken!" They could not believe it possible that they might be mistaken. The Sectarian is a person who fixes upon some non-essential, and who defies the

world to convince him that he may be mistaken.

The third element that you find in Sectarianism is this. It is the exaltation of tradition above the spirit of Christianity. I think that is the most deadly and most fatal thing of all. Humanity is a strange creation. There comes a prophet with a vision, and the traditionalists stone him or crucify him. Then in a few years they erect a monument and say, "He was right and we accept his vision." But, having done that, the next step is, they petrify that man's vision into another tradition, and make that tradition the cause and the ground for crucifying the next man who comes with a vision. That is always the way along which poor, wretched humanity has gone. That was what the Lord Jesus Christ fought against. He fought against tradition, He was crucified fighting against tradition; but the passions that crucified Him are to-day sanctified by His name. Let us beware of placing a tradition in the place of Jesus Christ. A tradition may be a theory about the Bible. But do not imagine for one moment that the Church is founded upon the Bible. The Church rests upon the

Spirit of God. It was not the Bible that produced the Church; it was the Church that produced the Bible. The fact is, whatever tradition you create, if that tradition is hostile to the spirit of love and unity and peace, that tradition is the Sectarian spirit.

Last of all—and this is the most important thing—the Sectarian spirit is the spirit that cripples the Church in its great enterprise of bringing the world into the kingdom of God. Why is it at the present moment that Christendom is so helpless? It is because for various unessential causes we have broken and divided the Church. What problems confront us! The problem of housing where the bodies and souls of our fellow-countrymen are perishing! the problem of alcohol which is destroying more lives every year, day in and day out, than perished in the Great War, or in all the wars in history! The Church sees these things, and the Church is crippled and helpless, because the Church has not a common policy and has not united its ranks. The Sectarian spirit leaves the Church crippled and divided in face of the problems confronting it.

We in Scotland have in the last fifteen

years been trying to re-unite Presbyterianism. I remember very vividly when we began to negotiate the very difficult problem of uniting the State Church, of which I happen to be a minister, and the United Free Church. Such a problem has not been tackled hitherto in the history of the world. I remember that when we met we met in a spirit of suspicion, of antagonism, of sectarianism—I mean both of us. I remember very well a very disastrous meeting when a man got up and made an uncompromising speech, showing all the blemishes of the other Church. Another man got up and made an equally disastrous speech, and the hall where we met, when these two speeches were over, was tense with feelings which nobody could name by the name of Jesus Christ. We felt it was all over, there was no use going on. Then a wonderful thing happened. A layman got up. He said, "Allow me to bring you to the upper chamber in Jerusalem." Then he began to recite to us the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, "I pray for them, that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee—that the world may believe." He went on to picture to us the condition of the great heathen

world, and we were preventing that heathen world from receiving the light because of our sectarianism and our divisions. Every man there had his head bowed before that layman stopped speaking, and when he had stopped speaking the Chairman said, "We will adjourn, after that, for a month." That man saved the situation. He rebuked the sectarian spirit by holding up the Lord Jesus Christ. And I say to you, brethren, there is no remedy for that spirit which divides and cripples the Church—no remedy but that we should sit at the feet of Christ and listen to the voice of Him who says, "This is My commandment, that ye love one another." Nothing matters, except that we love God and love the brethren.

You remember how Barnabas was sent down to Antioch when the early Christian Church was in danger of falling asunder, broken by the sectarian spirit. He came down to Antioch, but he did not begin by explaining to those early Christians in Antioch their various errors and heresies. Not a word about that. You remember what he did. "He exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord." What is cleaving? Cleaving is just *loving*. It is only

the person you love that you cleave to until your knuckles get white. And I say to you that the only remedy for the spirit which divides and desolates the Church—the only remedy is that exhortation of old: "Cleave unto the Lord." It is because love to the Lord Jesus has grown cold that the Church continues to be devastated by the spirit of Sectarianism. The way of deliverance is the way of love.

III. THE ROMANIST ERROR

By the Rev. I. Siviter, M.A.

To speak on the errors of Modernism is to gain, as it deserves, the applause of nearly all Evangelical Christians. To inveigh against the evils of Sectarianism, it matters not how exacerbating the language, will win the approval of nearly all Christendom. But when a speaker is called upon to expose the Romanist error, he is immediately "suspect" by many warm-hearted and noble Evangelical brethren. The fact that men like myself who, with love, occasionally lift up our voices against the spread of Romanism in our own Church, are regarded as "unsafe" and hardly fit to hold spiritually strategic positions in our communion, is ample proof of my assertion, if proof be needed. Why this should be so one can hardly say, unless it be that many Evangelical Christians are mistaking the sin of silence for the grace of charity. Everywhere this ominous Evan-

gelical silence seems to reign. I find myself frequently asking, "What has come over Evangelical Christendom? Where is the martyr-spirit of our fathers? where the old display of moral courage? Are we parting with our magnificent heritage? Why this silence everywhere when we have, as far as Romanism is concerned, a slumbering nation and an apologetic press; while Romanism itself comes with muffled foot, and stealing upon us like the night, undermines the verities of the precious Gospel. A somewhat jealous mood is at all times one of the best bulwarks for the defence of the Gospel, but at the present hour, when the causes of alarm are so imminent, we can scarcely be too watchful against the apathy in our own churches, or too alert to repel the inroads of a menace of all others the stealthiest and the basest.

I want to say at the outset that there are hundreds, maybe thousands of dear Christian souls in the Church of Rome. They love the Saviour, and are second to none in their devotion to Him. It is easy to blame such souls for remaining in a system which is apostate; but it should never be forgotten that the "Church" has been everything to

them, and the probabilities are that they have arrived at the truth which they possess through some book or person who bears the stamp of the Church. These men, to whom I refer, regard the Church (of Rome) as being the Body of Christ, the universal, miraculous society which is the embodiment of truth. Having no true knowledge of the nature of God's blood-bought Church, they look upon the Protestant churches and, in their bewilderment, ask which is the true one?

It is not then concerning the devotees of the system that I shall speak, but of the system itself and of those who are responsible for its operations. Having thus conceded to Romanism what Romanism will not concede to us, we may now proceed to the subject before us. The Romanist Error, a Menace to the Gospel. Shall we inquire first, What is the Gospel?

This inquiry is necessary, for, I suppose, all sections of the nominal Christian Church profess to have and to preach the Gospel. So then we ask what are the distinctive peculiarities of the Gospel as understood by Evangelical Christians? In answering this supremely important question I can do no

better than follow the lines laid down by the late Bishop of Liverpool—Dr. Ryle.

The first leading feature of the Gospel is the absolute supremacy it assigns to Holy Scripture, as the only rule of faith and practice, the only test of truth, and the only judge of controversy. Those who hold fast to the verities of the Gospel cannot be charged with Bibliolatry. We do not worship the literal book, we do not regard it as a fetish or charm, but we do hold that it *is*, not merely contains, *it is* the revelation of God to sinful men, and we steadily refuse to place any uninspired writings on a level with this revelation. To us there is but one test of truth : " Is it written ? " What saith the Lord ?

The second leading feature of the Gospel is the prominence it assigns to the doctrine of human sinfulness and corruption.

Man is far removed from original righteousness. He has a deep-seated disease, he needs a radical cure. In the old Gospel there is the unmistakable note about original sin, but there is the equally clear message that the blood of God's Son when applied to the conscience, and the grace of the Holy Ghost

in the renewal of the heart, can meet the deepest need.

The third grand feature of the Gospel is the prominence it gives to the work of the Lord Jesus Christ in His death, and the paramount importance it attaches to His present office as High Priest and Intercessor.

The Gospel of the Grace of God proclaims with no uncertain sound that the Lord Christ is, in His death, the Representative and the Substitute of poor sinners. It declares that a complete salvation has been procured. That Christ's sacrifice on Calvary is " that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual : and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

Further, a full-orbed Gospel does not neglect to emphasise the inward work of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man. True religion is an experimental business. There must be inward repentance, inward faith, inward hope, inward hatred of sin, and inward love to God's law; and all this the result of the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul.

Now the Church of Rome, while professing to build upon these great and important truths, has so overlaid them, so buried them beneath a mass of mingled falsehood, absurdity and blasphemy, and has so turned them from their peculiar and proper end, that they have become altogether inoperative for man's salvation or God's glory. In her hands they are the instruments, not of regenerating, but of enslaving the world. It has been eloquently said that "it is as if one should throw down a temple to liberty, and on its foundations proceed to rear a dungeon." On the everlasting stones of truth Rome has built a bastille for the human mind. Let it not be thought that Romanism is a crude, ill-digested, clumsy scheme. It possesses amazing subtlety and depth. It is the product of the combined intellects of successive ages, acute, powerful and crafty. The principle which regards the voice of the Church as the voice of God Himself has held such an influence and mastery over the minds of men of great intellectual acumen, that they have bowed in the humility of a child before everything that came with even the apparent authority

of the Church. As a piece of religious mechanism Romanism has never been equalled and probably will never be surpassed. It affords an amazing insight into the policy of him who is its real author. It lays bare the innate depravity and the deceitful workings of the human heart; for Romanism is but the religion of fallen human nature. It is the principle or error which may be defined to be *salvation of man,* in opposition to those truths of the Gospel we have outlined, which may be defined *salvation of God.* It is a dexterous substitution of the counterfeit for the real—a most elaborate and skilfully contrived counterfeit. This counterfeit system has its high priest—the Pope—who blasphemes the royal High Priesthood of Christ by assuming *His office,* when he pretends to be "Lord of the Conscience," "Lord of the Church," and "Lord of the world"; and by assuming His names, when he calls himself "The Light of the World," "The King of Glory," "The Lion of the Tribe of Judah," "Christ's Vicar and God's Vicegerent." (All these titles were assumed by Pope Leo X at his coronation.)

Romanism has, too, its counterfeit sacrifice

—the Mass—which blasphemes the Sacrifice of Christ by virtually teaching its inefficiency, and needing to be repeated, as is done when the priest offers the very body, soul, nerves and divinity of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead.

Romanism has its Bible, but it is supplemented by "the tradition of men," thus virtually teaching the insufficiency of the Word of God.

It has its mediators—saints and angels, and especially the Virgin—and thus it dishonours the One Mediator between God and man.

It does despite to the Person and Office of the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier, because it teaches that its sacraments *ex opere operato* can make holy.

It blasphemes God by teaching that priests can pardon sin, and can release from the obligations of divine law.

It has been tersely put thus:

"Romanism robs Christ of His kingly office, by exalting the Pope to His throne; it robs Him of His priesthood in the sacrifice of the Mass; it robs Him of His power as Mediator by substituting Mary; it robs Him

of His prophetical office by substituting the teachings of an infallible Church; it robs God the Spirit of His peculiar work as Sanctifier by attributing the power of conferring graces to its own ordinances; and it robs God the Father of His prerogatives by assuming the power of justifying and pardoning men."

Thus Romanism has spoilt the Gospel by *substitution*. It has withdrawn from the eyes of the sinner the grand object of faith—Jesus Christ—and has substituted the Church, the Confessional, and the Mass.

Romanism has spoilt the Gospel by *addition*. It has added to the Divine word. It has added to the sacraments of the Gospel, it has added to Christ objects which are considered equally worthy of honour.

Romanism has spoilt the Gospel by *interposition*. It has interposed the priest between the soul and Christ. It has interposed Mary between the sinner and the Saviour. In short, Romanism has made the Gospel no Gospel at all. Things have been added to it, or things taken away, or things put in their wrong places, or things set forth in their wrong proportions.

If it be argued that the Church of Rome possesses the indispensable characteristic of the true Church, viz. *Unity*, our reply is that when we name the Pope we indicate the extent of her unity. Here she is at one, on nearly every other point she is disagreed. Here is the testimony of one of the closest students of the system.

"What was sound doctrine in the sixth century, was heresy in the twelfth; and what was sufficient for salvation in the twelfth century, is altogether insufficient for it in our day. Transubstantiation was invented in the thirteenth century; it was followed, at a distance of three centuries, by the sacrifice of the Mass, and that again in our day by the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. In the twelfth century, the Lombardic theology, which mingled faith and works in the justification of the sinner, was in repute. This had its day and was succeeded about a hundred years after by the scholastic theology. The schoolmen discarded faith, and gave works alone a place in the important matter of justification. On the ruins of the scholastic divinity flourished the monastic theology. This system extolled

papal indulgences, adoration of images, prayers to saints, and works of supererogation; and on these grounds rested the sinner's justification. The Reformation came, and a modified theology next became fashionable. Now on the head of justification Jesuitical theology teaches that habitual righteousness is an infused grace, but that actual righteousness consists in the merit of good works. Here are five theologies which have successively been in vogue in the Church of Rome. Which of these five systems is the orthodox one? Or are they all orthodox?"

Moreover, the history of the Councils is that of a loud and discordant clatter; while what one "infallible" Bull has branded as sound doctrine, another "infallible" Bull has upheld as heresy. Such is the Unity with which Romanism so often and so tauntingly contrasts with what she calls "Protestant disunion." Rome's unity is that of dead matter, not a living body, whose several members obey the one will. With her rod of infallibility Rome touches the intellect and the conscience and benumbs them into torpor. This she calls Unity.

There can be no union on our part with a system which puts out the eyes of men, so that there be only one opinion about colour; which fetters the understandings of men, so that there be but one opinion regarding religion. To re-unite with Rome, until she is cleansed of her superstitions, idolatries, and tyrannies, would be a base desertion of the grand old principles of the old Gospel that have given us political, ecclesiastical and religious liberty. *And yet there is a crisis upon us.* Since the Edict from the Flaminian Gate in 1850, by which, in the eyes of Romanists, Great Britain was joined to the Seven Hills, and which made the only valid authority in Great Britain to Romanists that of the Vatican—since that time Romanism has put forth every ounce of its strength to undermine and overthrow the Gospel that made us free.

"Your cathedral," Monsignor Talbot wrote to Cardinal Manning from the pontifical chambers of the Vatican, "will serve all purposes until we get St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey." The Edict from the Flaminian Gate, which restored the Roman hierarchy in England, the promulgation of

Infallibility in 1870, and the issue of Tract 90 in the Church of England, have been followed by a silent diffusion of "Catholic" ideas and doctrines, until we find it possible for a shrewd thinker and writer like Dr. R. F. Horton to say: "The conversion of England is not impossible, nor, humanly speaking, improbable; and it is quite within the range of possibility in another generation."

Tractarianism, alias Ritualism and Anglo-Catholicism, has so thoroughly leavened the Church of England that Cardinal Vaughan exclaimed, speaking of the Romanisers in the Church of England, "To their unspeakable honour be it said that multitudes, once the assailants of Catholic doctrine, have become its supporters and confessors. They who cast out the altar and stripped the church have re-erected the altar and re-furnished the church. They who denounced auricular confessions are hearing confessions; they who blasphemed the Mass are trying to say Mass; they who denied the sacerdotal powers of Rome claim to possess and exercise those powers. The iconoclasts have replaced the statues of the Mother of God and the saints in their niches of honour."

Now listen to the testimony of Mr. Athelstan Riley: "On thousands of altars in the Church of England lies the Roman Missal." Add to that the fact that for the first time since the Reformation, in 1922 Anglo-Catholic Congresses re-introduced High Mass into the Cathedrals of England, the Cathedral of my own Diocese being used for this purpose. At the Birmingham Diocesan Conference in April last, I was practically shouted down when I declared that the Mass was alien to the Church of England. The irreducible minimum of the Anglo-Catholic is the re-introduction of the Mass into the Church of England, with reservation of the Sacrament and Prayers for the Dead with its attendant doctrine of a Purgatorial state.

But what is more astounding is the change that is coming over the Nonconformist churches. Nonconformity was considered immune from this great evil. This was considered the great bulwark of Protestant freedom, and the impregnable fortress of simple Gospel truth. But a silent revolution is now going on. A leading Nonconformist minister is clandestinely ordained "Priest";

"High Mass" is offered up in the places where the Gospel of God's grace has resounded for years. Trust deeds are openly and flagrantly violated in the interests of priestism and "free Catholicism." Principles for which godly men went to the stake, and suffered other forms of persecution, are openly betrayed by those professing to be their successors.

Sacramentarianism is supplanting the old Gospel, ever loved by all Free Churchmen, of Ruin by Sin, Redemption by Blood, and Regeneration by the Spirit. Dr. Orchard writes in a "Foreword" to a book on *The Value of the Sacraments*, by the Rev. W. C. Peck, a Methodist: "It may strike many readers . . . as somewhat crazy and bizarre, that a Minister of one of the freest of Free Churches should seek to recommend the rationality of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, to set forth the Evangelical sanction of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to plead for the adorability of the Sacrament."

The same writer, speaking of what he considers the value of the Mass in connection with the old message, "Come to Jesus," says: "This itself is made more effective if there is

Something which afterwards people can be directed to worship and adore: when you have said, 'Come to Jesus,' it is something to say, 'Here He is' (pointing to the Mass); in fact, it needs just this to give point to Free Church preaching, and the use of *Benediction* is probably the very best means for bringing the hearers of an Evangelical sermon to the point of decision and assurance." Again, "Celebrate the sacrament as a representative act of the Church, and the eastward position and vestments will soon be found necessary." This "Foreword" is followed by a book which is an elaborate argument for Transubstantiation, the Mass, and Adoration of the Sacrament. It is profoundly disturbing to find Methodist ministers "selling the pass" and forging again the fetters from which a glorious Reformation delivered us.

With these facts before us I submit that if our Evangelical conception of the Gospel is the true one, then it is menaced to-day as never before. The foundations are being destroyed, and the battering-rams are being hurled against the ramparts. The Gospel of God's Grace is assailed. Luther's dis-

covery of free grace in Christ meant for him deliverance from the terrors of a religion without an Evangel. The Reformed Churches were built up upon the doctrines of grace. The New Testament teaching of salvation is based on grace. It exhorts the sinner to confide his all to Christ the Saviour, trusting neither to Church nor priest nor ritual, but only and solely to Him who loved him and gave Himself for him.

This doctrine, so precious and so true, is challenged by the doctrines of Romanism. The sweet and refreshing truth of justification by faith is challenged by doctrines which imply an incomplete pardon and make the devotee the spiritual slave of a human priesthood which can terrify but which cannot fully absolve. The Romanist has no blessed assurance of salvation, for he is told, "Never consider after the lapse of some period of time that prayers and masses are no longer needed: for hundreds of years souls may be in purgatory, suppliants on the charity of succeeding generations" (*The Crown of Jesus*, pp. 310, 311).

Dr. Dale said rightly of Dr. Pusey, that in parting with the Lutheran truth con-

cerning Justification he parted with the springs of gladness.

The doctrine of personal and immediate access to the saving God and His Christ is challenged on every hand by Romanism. "Sew no clouts upon Christ's robe," said godly Samuel Rutherford. "None but Jesus can do helpless sinners good;" and the quickest way to approach Him is the best and safest way.

In the biography entitled *Coillard of the Zambesi,* it is related how an old Matabele woman used to come a long way to receive instruction from the missionary's wife. She had to pass a Romanist Mission Station, and one day the priest met her and asked where she had been. When she told him, he said, "Indeed, and to whom do these Protestants pray?" "To the Lord Jesus, our Saviour." "Ah, they do not teach you the whole truth. Now, how can He listen to the prayers of a poor old woman like you? It is to His Mother you should speak; she will bring your prayers to Him, and then He will grant them." "What did you answer?" inquired M. Coillard. "Oh, what could a stupid old woman like me say to that wise

man? I could only tell him, 'It was not His Mother I saw hanging on the Cross for me; it was Himself. That is why I pray to Him.'" That old woman had caught a glimpse of the great truth of the grace of God which is at the heart of our Gospel.

The strongest indictment of a system professedly Christian is that wherever it has power, Romanism has made its people the pawns of the priests, and while the hierarchy provide for themselves, the common people sink deeper into ignorance, profligacy and indifference. South America is a conspicuous instance of this crippling tendency.

Is it for this that we are willing to let go our old Gospel verities? Is it for this that the Churches of the Establishment are abandoning its Gospel liturgies, and its simple services, assimilating them to those of Rome? Is it for this that some of our Nonconformist brethren are willing to forgo the old Evangel for the mummeries of a system corrupt and apostate?

If so, then write "Ichabod" across the portals of our churches. If so, then we shall experience the inevitable decay of all those institutions that have pointed the way to

progress. If so, there will slip from our grasp all the rich fruits of that blessed and glorious movement concerning which Lecky the historian declares: "There certainly never has been a movement which, in its ultimate results, has contributed so largely to the emancipation of the human mind from all superstitious terrors as the Reformation."

But this must not be so. By preaching and praying, by pulpit and by platform, and by printing and by speaking, let us labour to maintain the Gospel verities in our dear land. The people of this country do not love Romanism. Moreover, God Himself is with us, the truth is on our side. Be the issue of the conflict what it may, let us nail our Gospel colours to the mast, let us keep the banner of the Cross flying. Let us settle it deeply in our minds that our Churches without the old, old story—the precious Gospel of God's free and sovereign grace—will be as wells without water, and as lamps without a light.

The shades of error are deepening around us into the black night of apostasy, yet it is not too late to work and to pray for a mighty God-sent sweeping revival which shall bring

our Churches and country back to the old Gospel of Jesus and His love, a Gospel which has made England the mightiest instrument for the truth in the world. God grant it. This is the Fundamental Need of England.

I. THE CENTRALITY OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

By the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr

"And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth" (Rev. v. 6).

THE book of the Apocalypse, for many religious people, is under a cloud to-day. By a certain few it is almost despised, as if it were a jumble of incoherent images—the product of a strange and disordered fancy. By far more it is *avoided*, as if it were an intricate set of symbols, the explanation of which is for ever beyond us. Whatever be the cause or causes of this indifference or suspicion, the fact itself is deeply to be regretted. For there is no book in the whole Bible which is richer in spiritual meanings, and fuller of practical significance for our own time, than *this* Book. We may admit freely that some of its fine details are still enveloped in a concealing mist, that certain of its symbols do not easily yield their meaning, and that it is necessary to leave a wide margin for secondary inter-

pretations; but after all this there yet remains, in clear and splendid relief, the one great Central Truth of the Book to which all the symbols are bound, and of which they are the expression. This truth is fundamental for Christianity. It is eternally vital—vital for that time, vital for our time, and vital for all time. It is a truth which, once it becomes our very own, clears the vision, warms the heart, quickens the conscience, strengthens the will, and provides the dynamic for all fine Christian living and service. It is the truth of *the Centrality of our Lord Jesus Christ* in the whole scheme of things, and of His absolute lordship over the life of man and of the world. Whatever uncertainty may attach to some of the symbols employed in the Book, there can be no uncertainty concerning this main truth which is set forth to the accompaniment of trumpets and Hallelujahs.

The problem of the book of Apocalypse is a very simple one. It is this: shall the Lamb—that is, the Divine Lord who gave Himself in sacrifice for the redemption of the world—or the Beast—the world power of the day, materialistic and often devilish—rule over the life of man? THE LAMB AND THE

BEAST! these are the two central figures of the book! The gentle and Divine power of the One, and the brutal and demoniac power of the other, are set in vivid contrast in a series of symbolic images. The war between the two is depicted, and at the end the Beast is seen for ever vanquished—his flesh given to the vultures—while the Lamb is upon the throne, King of kings and Lord of lords. There was no doubt in the mind of St. John as to who should, and who shall, finally rule the world.

The problem of the book of the Apocalypse is *our* problem too. Still the conflict rages between Cæsar and Christ. The Beast is still abroad branding his fatal mark upon the brow of man, and uniting the powers of evil against our God and His Christ. The person of Christ, the claims of Christ, and the ethics of Christ clash with the pride and the passions of men, which in turn rise up to resist Him.

The *methods* of the Beast have been modified by the power of civilisation, but the *aim* of the Beast remains the same.

What is to be the issue of the conflict? Can we share the triumphant faith of St. John and of the early Church? And if so,

upon what must that faith be supported? The whole secret, I submit to you, is offered to us in this fifth chapter of the book of the Apocalypse. It is, from the point of view of faith, the central chapter of the book. The Seer is in deep distress. He is weeping bitterly as he contemplates existence. The present is to him full of dread and peril. The edict of persecution has gone forth. The Emperor is defiling the souls of men with degrading idolatry. Before the statue of Cæsar men are commanded to burn incense. The infant Church is being subjected to the scorching of an intense fire. St. John himself is banished to the mines of Patmos for the testimony of Jesus. This Apostle and teacher of the Church is anxious about the future. What does it hold for the world, and in particular for the Church which Christ purchased with His blood? He looks upward, and beholds upon the hand of God the roll of Destiny strongly sealed with seven seals. Not a man, not an angel is worthy to break the seals. The future is not in the hands of man or angel. Then, in a flash, the Revelation comes. An Elder, speaking in the symbolic language of the Old Testament, indicates that the

Messiah, set forth under the national emblem of the Lion, has won the right to direct that future. The Seer turns to see the Lion, and lo! he beholds a Lamb, as though it had been slain. In a moment the Jewish picture passes into the Christian picture. No more do we hear of the Lion conquering. Henceforth it is the Lamb—that Divine Person who in Himself at once fulfilled the prophetic word which spake of "One led as a Lamb to the slaughter," and the priestly rites which pointed to Him who by the sacrifice of Himself consummated every sacrifice. He does what men and angels are unworthy to do. He alone is worthy of the great task. Lamb though He be, there is no weakness in Him. He possesses the plenitude of power, as symbolised by the seven horns; and the plenitude of wisdom, as symbolised by the seven eyes. And all this He has won by His sacrifice. In Hands such as His the future is safe. He cannot fail. Highly significant is it that upon the proclamation of His worthiness all fall down to worship Him. They do not wait until the seals are broken and the secrets revealed. They "do not ask to see the distant scene." They trust Him abso-

lutely. They sing their Doxology, not at the *end* of the event, when all meanings become clear, but at the *beginning*, when the meanings are still hidden. Again, it is significant that after this revelation of Christ's competence, there is no further mention of bitter weeping and anxiety on the part of the Seer. All in the book beyond this point is keyed to the note of high thanksgiving, and the final scene ends with a Hallelujah Chorus: "I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of many thunders saying, Hallelujah, for the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigneth."

In this great central chapter we have far more than the faith of one imaginative man expressing itself. It is *the whole Church* that speaks. The heart of the primitive Church is revealed to us. What is here set forth symbolically is exactly the same faith to which St. Paul gave a theological and philosophical form. The Christ of the Apocalypse is the Christ of the Epistles to the Romans and Colossians. The early Church knew but one Christ—Lord of all—whose lordship was founded upon His redeeming work. They knew Him in personal experience. He had

redeemed them. Their theology grew out of their spiritual experience of His grace. They were not in intellectual bondage to artificial dogmas created by speculative thinking. They rejoiced in the warmth of an enveloping love which liberated them from the power of their sins, and brought them into perfect harmony with God. They possessed a living faith in a living Lord; a masculine faith which, while it was emotional, was also dynamic, creating character, generating endurance, and ensuring victory over the world.

That faith of the Primitive Church in the absolute Lordship of Christ as based upon His redeeming work has never changed. It remains to-day, as ever, central for the thought and life of the Evangelical body. There have been times when it has suffered eclipse. Fugitive philosophies, vain speculations, troublesome passions, a weakened devotional tone, a lowered spiritual vitality, and the force of worldly opinion, have in turn thrown their baleful shadows over the soul of man and deprived it of the warmth and glory of the redeeming mercy of the Son of God. But the eclipse has always passed, as

eclipses always do, and the Sun has shone forth again, bringing healing in its beams. We, in our time, have felt the chill of the shadow; we feel it still, but we believe it will pass away, and that once again, in the warmth of a great religious revival, we shall witness a return to that ancient and simple and fundamental faith in Christ our Lord, in the might of which the modern Church will repeat the ancient victories. The most pressing need of our time is a recovery, *within the Church*, of that vital faith in the Son of God, by which alone we overcome the world. For the Church, alas! in place of overcoming the world, has been largely overcome by it; overcome by its speculations, its spirit, its rationalism, its cynicism, its agnosticism, its materialism. The modern Beast no longer draws the sword against the Divine Society, he finds more effective the method of asphyxiation by means of poisonous vapours which, unperceived, penetrate and paralyse the very soul. It is the enveloping atmosphere of the worldly spirit which to-day constitutes our deadliest peril, and nothing can effectively repel this attack but a vital spiritual experience rooted in a real union with the living Lord.

Human pride to-day bitterly opposes the central faith by which the Church lives. It has no place for the idea of a Divine Sacrifice on behalf of human redemption. 1. It has no place for the idea of the Divine Lamb reigning over the world. It has no place for the idea of a Divine Sacrifice on behalf of human redemption. From the beginning the Cross has been an offence to the proud man. It offends his dignity, and he professes that it outrages his ethical sense. But what if his dignity be false and his ethical sense be deflected? What if he refuse to face the facts of human nature as it really is, and not as he imagines it to be? And what if he fail to comprehend the truth that Love which gives itself to the utmost—even unto death—to secure the highest advantage for its object, expresses the highest ethical law? It is pride, and pride alone, that blinds the eyes of men to the realities of sin and of Divine Redemption. Whenever pride has run high in any given epoch, there men have made a mock of sin, and have treated with lightness or contempt the Divine Sacrifice offered on behalf of human salvation. But where pride has been abased, and the stark realities of

human life have compelled repentance, then men have returned, humbly, and with beating of the breast, to the Cross. This is the inner story of every great religious awakening, and the persistence of the phenomenon throughout the ages is a proof that here we are in the presence of a law of life. If history has anything to teach us it is this, that when the sense of sin has disappeared or become weakened in any community, then the Cross of Christ has vanished into the mist. Men, having no consciousness of sickness, think nothing of the Physician. But, on the contrary, when the sense of sin is real, then men recognise that in the Cross lies their one hope. And is there anything more calculated to awaken the sense of sin than the true preaching of the Cross? The sense of sin and the Cross act and react upon each other. The one calls for the other. The penitent sinner cries for the Redeemer. The Redeemer, shown upon the Cross, creates penitence in the sinner.

Pride, I have said, opposes the faith by which the Church lives. But where should pride be to-day? In the easy days before the war we were told that the "higher man was not worrying about his sins." He ought

to be worrying about them *now*, or he is worse than proud—he is criminal. Is this the time for pride—for the vaunting of the "higher man"—after the infernal happenings of the dreadful war years? Shall we still prate of not worrying about our sins when the blood of millions of murdered men cries from the ground to high heaven? Dare the world still wipe its mouth and declare its super-excellence, after it has pressed into the service of the devil the talent of the engineer and the chemist for the wholesale blasting of human life? In the easy days before the war there was widespread revolt against the idea of a Divine Man immolated for the sins of the world. The Atonement was even said to be immoral. And the very epoch which turned from the Cross and expressed its disgust with the thought of blood shed for human redemption, has been compelled to watch the soil soaked to repletion with the blood of martyred youth, which now it glorifies, and to the memory of which it raises Cenotaphs and monuments. The world has had enough to abase its pride, yet still it refuses to admit its sin and to cry to God for mercy. Until it humiliates itself and kneels, in humble

penitence, before Him whom it has re-crucified, there can be no healing of its wound, nor prosperity for its soul, nor progress for its feet.

2. Human pride, also, has had, and still has, no place for the idea of God's Divine Lamb reigning over the world. The charge brought against Belshazzar by the prophet may with justice be brought against our epoch—" Thou hast praised the gods of silver and gold, of brass and iron, wood and stone, and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, thou hast not glorified." Men who know nothing of the secret of the living God always incline to a profound faith in material things, and particularly in material force. In our time this faith has risen to the height of a gross idolatry. It has become a religion. Men worship force. Never before in the history of the world has force been so invested with the attributes of Divinity as to-day. The force of *money*, by which alone pure pleasure is supposed to be procured, true place guaranteed, and overwhelming success achieved. The force of *spectacle*, through which man, victimised by the passing show, is prevented from reflecting upon the things which pertain unto his peace.

The force of *institutions*, the imposing splendour of which silences the conscience and creates moral cowardice. The force of *arms*, by which peoples are held in subjection, and, when misunderstandings arise, are subjected to the hellish cruelties of war. The nations have taken for their symbols the birds and beasts of prey—the Lion and the Eagle. Where is there one—even a nominal Christian nation—that has dared to adopt the Divine symbol of the Lamb? Adopt it! Our epoch scorns the thought, believing it to be absurd, effeminate, unworthy, or at the best wholly impracticable. Our age has committed itself to the idea that man is just a higher beast—some way ahead of his lowlier brethren, but yet belonging to their order, and condemned at last to share their fate. From the jungle he has come; to the tomb, common to man and beast, must he march. There is nothing Divine in him. He was never made in the likeness and image of God. Any God there is has been made in man's image and likeness, being no more than the creation of his imagination and fear. Life is a vast struggle for existence, and with man, as with beasts, the race goes to the swift, the victory to the

strong. Whatever amelioration is offered to the unfortunate, proceeds, not from the recognition of their spiritual nature, so much as from the presence of a social uneasiness which divines that misery unrelieved may become desperate, and turn round upon those whose wealth mocks it. But the deeper notes of love and brotherhood in Christ are not sounded, because they are disbelieved. For the miserable, the weary, and the incurable even a Dr. Haeckel has nothing better to prescribe than suicide. Since there is nothing beyond this life, no God to believe in, no Saviour to redeem, the shortening of life by means of a violent end is an act of courage and of virtue! To such infernal logic does the materialist, who admits no God, commit himself.

To counterbalance this horror, the Superman of Nietzsche was created. But again force was exalted—man was all in all and he must rule by force. Contempt, even to the point of vituperation, was poured upon Christianity, which was designated a "slave religion." The ideas of these and other false masters penetrated the minds of millions, and the result was the violent explosion which

laid Europe in ruins. Men may disguise it as they will, and seek for the causes of the late war in immoral diplomacy, commercial envy, unprincipled journalism, and unnatural greed; the fact remains that the *radical* cause of the disaster which in 1914 overtook the world is to be found in the deliberate repudiation by mankind of the Lamb of God as its only true ruler, and the enthronement in His place of the Beast. Does the world now believe this? Does it see its colossal error and sin? Is it cured of its fatal trust in force? Let the present state of Europe and the increase in armaments in nearly all civilised countries supply the answer. In every place, God be thanked, there are deep stirrings of conscience and a growing uneasiness concerning the whole matter. The Churches are speaking with no uncertain sound. But the world as a whole has learned little from its bitter experience. The Beast is still the popular idol. Must there be another hell let loose before mankind will return to its senses, and offer its sole worship to the Lamb of God?

What is the great business of the Church of God in this critical hour of human life? The Church is Christ's body: the medium

through which the Living Head expresses Himself in the world. The Church is meant to be vocal for Him, and active for Him. It is His witness to mankind. It has no other *raison d'être* than this. When it degenerates into a club, or an entertainment society, or a company of religious formalists, it suffers degradation and eclipse, and justly earns the contempt of men. Our business is not primarily to formulate a philosophy or a theology—although we are bound to do both—but to bear unceasing witness by lip and in life to the Lamb of God as the Redeemer and the Lord of the world. It is to a Person that we bear witness; One who has appeared in history and to whom historical documents and institutions testify; One who is at work in personal human lives, delivering them from the grip of sin and empowering them for all holy service—the Christ of history and the Christ of experience. The heart of this witness lies in the Cross and in the throne: the Christ yielding His life in sacrifice for the sins of the world, and the Christ reigning as the Lamb, by the power of gentleness, love and holiness, winning by His wounds and not by the sword. This central witness to Christ

has from the beginning of its career been the distinguishing mark of the World's Evangelical Alliance. The Alliance has brought together men of diverse minds and varied outlook who are nevertheless one in the things that matter. It has ever realised that the real centre of unity is found in the common loyal devotion of Christians to Him who by His Cross redeemed the world. For it Christ is supreme. He transcends both nation and denomination. "To Him shall the gathering of the people be." Such an Alliance, providing, as it does, a common meeting-ground for all to whom Christ is all, should command the sympathy and support of all Evangelical Christians. Single voices here and there, speaking amidst the din and noise of the modern world, are feeble and liable to be unheard. But a combined voice, speaking from such a platform as that of the Alliance, utters itself as a trumpet and compels attention. Let us, by aiding it, ensure that its sound shall be increasingly clear and effective. But in the last analysis, for an effective witness to be borne to Christ, it is necessary that the entire body of Christian people shall recover the glory and the power of the Evangelical faith which works

by love. Too long have we been speaking with bated breath concerning the Person of Christ. We have seen Him analysed, criticised, diminished and reduced to ordinary proportions by the apparatus of modern investigation, and we have feared lest, after all, His glory should depart. But now we see by the light of the red fires of war that it is not *His* glory which has been dimmed, but *theirs* who criticised Him and refused to obey Him. The supposed giants of yesterday have become the real dwarfs of to-day, while away to the horizon there stands but one supreme Figure—the true Lord and Redeemer of Men, Jesus Christ. Christians must one and all recover the faded vision of the Seer of Patmos and behold the Lamb of God as central in Sacrifice and central in Rulership. A new and fuller experience of Christ would wipe away all our tears, dismiss all our doubts and give to us the invincible certitude of the final victory. There is no hope for the world save in the ancient Gospel as preached and practised by the Church in a new and living way. To this immense task Christ calls us. To His call let us make answer, "Here am I, send me."

II. THE CHURCH AND THE KINGDOM

By the Very Rev. E. A. Burroughs, D.D. (Dean of Bristol)

" But seek ye first His Kingdom and righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you " (St. Matt. vi. 33).

THE Evangelical temper has always been sensitive to the existence and the spiritual needs of the world. It has perhaps thought more of the world—the problem—than of the Church—the Divine solution of it. At any rate, the phrase " the Church," so dear to another type of Christians, is not so often on Evangelical lips. On the whole, it may be said that " the Kingdom " takes its place; that is, the sphere of God's influence upon earth, extending further, as it does, than even the aggregate of all the Churches, and differing from " the Church " essentially in not having visible frontiers nor organisation.

Hence at once the missionary impetus in Evangelical Christianity and its interdenominational tendency. Where attention is directed in the first instance to the Church as the Body of Christ, it is natural that the

needs of the Body should first receive consideration, not so much in priority to the needs of the world, as in order that the needs of the world may be the more completely met. But the result does somehow tend to be excessive emphasis on organisation, on corporate unity, on rules that make for discipline, until such means to the end begin to obscure the end itself, and life is sacrificed to system. The Evangelical, on the other hand, thinking of the unsaved world, looking at it as the battlefield for the Kingdom, judging the Christian forces engaged not by their formation, but by their fighting qualities, thinking of himself as an agent of the Kingdom simply because he belongs to its King, is naturally impatient of what seem to be mainly formal considerations. Claiming that "in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision," he leaps lightly over both the barriers which St. Paul thus tells us Christ has abolished: those of denomination as well as those of race. His aim is to seek first God's Kingdom and righteousness in any practical direction possible; and he feels sure that ecclesiastical principles, in so far as they matter, will look

after themselves. "But seek ye first His Kingdom and righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Now there is much that might be said to show that Evangelicals have lost in many ways by this reckless practical bias. It has often been claimed that, so far as the Church of England is concerned, we should be much stronger in the Home Church if so many of our best men did not go abroad. We should certainly be stronger, not to say supreme, if a sense of the non-importance of polity had not led so many adherents of the one Evangelical tradition to organise themselves in separate groups. Unquestionably, too, we should not be so crippled, in this day of opportunity, by doctrinal dissensions among ourselves if a stronger faith in corporate fellowship, as in itself a means of grace, had tempered our emphasis on private judgment. It is, no doubt, the Christian privilege of each man to "prove all things" individually; but not, regardless of consequences, to "hold fast that which" *he himself* thinks to be "good." We have lost, that is to say, as well as gained by our particular "proportion of faith"; and for us too there is still the

need to "press on towards" a higher synthesis, "the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus." But, for all that, we may still claim, I submit, to be nearer both to the mind of the New Testament and to the needs of the present age in putting the mystical and the moral aspects of our religion definitely above the institutional, and bringing questions of ecclesiastical principle to the one test of their bearing on the Kingdom of God. "But seek ye first His Kingdom and righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

True Evangelicalism has always stood for the moral and the mystical aspects of Christianity *combined:* the free life of the One Spirit, blowing when it will, but always and only validly manifesting itself in moral goodness and spiritual power. "The solid foundation of God standeth, having this seal: 'The Lord knoweth them that are His,' and 'Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity.'" When the personal relation with Jesus Christ is guaranteed by the life, there is no need for further inquisition or tests. True, there is an Evangelicalism to-day, sometimes claiming to be the only

genuine variety, which seeks to impose tests of the most rigid kind, and so, in the expressive Greek idiom, "escapes its own notice, becoming institutional"—after all, putting the system before the Spirit. And sometimes, in the same process, it loses the first moral fruit of the Spirit, which is Love. Institutionalism of any kind does tend to weaken the moral note as well as depreciating the mystical. But into that controversy I do not want to enter. My point is that the true Evangelical tradition has the New Testament behind it, and the needs of this age to call it on, in putting the institutional side of Christianity definitely second to the moral and mystical, and so making more of the Kingdom than of the Church. It is a restoration of Christian moral standards, and of the Christian power to live up to them, that this unhappy age most desperately needs. And at the same time it is quite obvious that it will not accept those standards simply on the authority of official Churches, Established or Free, nor draw the spiritual strength it lacks from official sources which those Churches prescribe. It awaits a free movement, a new wind, of the Spirit; and it will judge its

significance by its moral effects. If we Evangelicals can be wisely true to our best traditions, it is surely from our quarter that such a new wind might be expected to blow.

But first we need, I venture to think, a stronger sense of present realities and a wider appreciation of what "the Kingdom" means. Dare I say that we need rather less theological sensitiveness in proportion, and a keener moral sensitiveness instead? That is to say, it is more important that we should boldly tackle moral issues than that we should get our theological and ecclesiastical differences nicely straightened out. This will give us, at any rate, a working principle in dealing alike with the problem of Christian Unity and with that of World Evangelisation.

On the first I must not dwell at length, especially as other Congress speakers are to approach it from a different and more devotional angle. But it does seem to me that we all need to make paramount the moral rather than the theological issues: to think in terms of the world's moral need and not of our own doctrinal traditions.

We protest against the way in which a certain type of "Catholic" Churchman

insists on ecclesiastical qualifications, discounts the evidences of the Spirit's Presence, and will not communicate except with those who are ordained exactly as he approves. But is there not still, in all our Churches, a needless clinging to our own traditions, an emphasis on the particular truth vouchsafed (as we believe) to us and our fathers, which stands just as truly in the way of reunion, and which a really vivid sense of the world's danger and the Church's needs would compel us to sacrifice to the Spirit of Christ? It has been pretty generally conceded that *no* Church is going to find itself part of the coming unity on its own terms, and, moreover, that the basis of any really world-wide unity must in some sense be episcopal. Might not our very refusal to put organisation in the first place be a reason for contemplating reorganisation more readily, provided that it can be made quite clear that readjustment of system is solely for the sake of practical unity, and not in the interests of any theory of what unity involves?

Till all we Evangelical Christians of England can make our pronouncements as one body, I fear that the Anglo-Catholic Congresses are

likely to put our attempted equivalents to shame; and the world, which judges by what it sees, and not by its reason, will not be convinced that the future of British religion is with us. Personally I am of those who would go to almost any lengths to convince non-episcopal Evangelicals that we, their "partners in the other ship," regard them as already members of the One Body in the fullest sense, and only ask them to come in with us in order that the Body may be One,—"that the world may know" what now we seem unable to teach it. But before we on our side can go to those lengths of intercommunion for which we are prepared, we must have evidence that we are not merely alienating further our own fellow-Churchmen of another type, but really contributing to a real reunion. Might we not, on both sides, stake something on the promise of our text, that an honest quest of conditions needed for spreading the Kingdom, though it must involve sacrifice, will not involve loss?

But there are other ways in which, it seems to me, we must bind ourselves to serve the Kingdom before our evangelisation can be very effectual at home or abroad. Evan-

gelicalism, as we have seen, has always tended to think in terms of the world. Its genius is international as well as interdenominational. Where is its international witness to-day?

The two forces which are setting the goal and the pace in international politics are nationalism and materialism, hand in hand. They are the two evil spirits which led the world into the war, and were supposed to have been for ever discredited by it. Both are dead contrary to the spirit and outlook of Christ. Both are condemned in the words of my text, which is at once a warning against material preoccupations and a call to a supernational loyalty. Yet both are returning to power to-day unchecked, with the "seven spirits worse than themselves" in attendance. Why? Because, in the words of that same terrific parable, they found their old tenement "empty, swept, and garnished," instead of newly garrisoned with the Spirit of Christ. That Spirit was vindicated by the whole logic of the war. It has since grown more and more apparent that only in that Spirit can we solve the problems of peace. In so far as any experiment has been made in that direction, it has been vindicated

sufficiently to encourage us to go on. The experiments in the opposite direction have conspicuously brought us nearer to the abyss. If there had been a really Christian nation, capable of embodying the law of Christ in its post-war policy, we should by now, I believe, have seen it well on its way to a new kind of leadership among men, proving on a vast scale the claim of our text,—that there is nothing so practical, or even "paying," as a consistently Christian idealism. As it is, we can at least claim this, that no set of principles can ever have had stronger *negative* evidence of their truth and necessity than that afforded to the principles of Jesus Christ by the world-wide results of *not* applying them.

And the question is, What about at least proclaiming them now? If there is not a Christian nation to apply them, at least there are Christian Churches which should, all the more for that reason, be proclaiming what they are. But there again we stumble on our disunion. Christ has many mouthpieces but no voice. And the effect is startling and depressing at once. You remember how ready, during the war, the spokesmen of the

Churches generally were to identify the cause of our country with the Cause of Christ,—sometimes in terms which made one blush even then. Why has there not been any similar protest against the unchecked march, this time in French uniforms, of the same false principles—nationalism and materialism—which it was our sacred duty to fight to the death when they confronted us in German field-grey? It is not surprising if the Germans, subjected to-day (by the admission of *The Times* itself) to a reign of terror, in defiance of the terms of the Treaty, put down our war-time talk of moral principles as so much British cant. The French to-day are confirming the victory of the German idea.

Fifty years hence it will be a commonplace of history that the one thing which could have saved the post-war world from disaster was a literal application of the principles of Jesus Christ, especially in the treatment of ex-enemies. It will be recognised that we British, at any rate, had impulses in the right direction, and saw that generosity was, for that matter, also economically sound. Men will wonder how, in this spring of 1923, we

came to be so careless of our principles and our interests alike, when both coincided. And I fear they will not unjustly blame the Christian Churches if "the things that make for peace" were, apparently, "hid from our eyes." Already critical outside voices—Professor Zimmern's, for instance, in his *Europe in Convalescence*—are asking where were the Churches of this country in the spring and summer of 1919, and why there was no Christian protest against the Treaty. It is not so difficult to defend inaction at that stage, in the general ignorance and confusion. But to-day the issues have grown quite clear, and the effects of the revived materialism are already threatening world-wide disaster.

I have spoken of the most obvious and urgent of our international problems; but of course what is happening in occupied Germany is also happening, in one form or another, more or less all over the world. Everywhere men seem to be valuing money more than friends, thinking in terms of economic rather than human relations, treating Fear as a safer guide than Faith, subdividing unities already arrived at, instead of reaching forth toward the brotherhood of

all mankind. Everywhere, that is to say, we are moving *against* the leading principles of Jesus Christ.

And here is my point. We Evangelicals are by way of wanting to preach the Gospel to the world. Our great tradition is Foreign Missionary effort. To-night this Congress ends on that note. The Gospel we take our title from is one to be preached "to every creature." Well, do we sufficiently remember how much "the Gospel" includes? that, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount is part of it? that *all* the words of Christ are "words of eternal life," and that any attempt, in any sphere, to live by other principles is a counsel of death? Is it much good to go on preaching the gospel of individual salvation to the heathen in other continents when by Christian Europe the gospel of corporate salvation is being steadily ignored? when, that is, the Divine rules for general well-being are suffering conspicuous violation all round, and the Churches, for whatever reason, are unable or unwilling even effectually to protest?

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be

added unto you." We must enlarge the meaning of "world-evangelisation,"—both what we mean by the Gospel and what we mean by the world. Especially must we treat the State as the direct object of evangelisation. The attempt to do so will bring home to us afresh the hopelessness of our present disunion, and give a new inspiration for ending it. And the sight of a Church forgetting itself in the zeal for the Kingdom, and risking everything to proclaim the principles of the world-politics of Jesus Christ, will do more than anything to restore the influence which to-day we obviously lack, and so renew our opportunities for what must always be our principal task, the winning of individual souls to God.

I. ITS IMPERATIVE APPEAL

By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Welldon, D.D. (Dean of Durham)

THERE is perhaps no subject of deeper and wider interest in Christendom to-day than Christian Reunion. Ever and again in the life of Christendom the Holy Spirit of God has awakened the minds and hearts of Christians to the consciousness of some great evil which had until then been wholly or generally ignored. The evil may have been cruelty, whether to children or to the animals; it may have been political or spiritual tyranny; it may have been personal slavery and the Slave Trade. It is now the severance, nay, the hostility, of the Christian Churches; and they who have ears to hear, if they will hear what the Spirit says to the Churches, know that it is their duty to redress, and if possible in the end to destroy, this evil.

The disunion of the Churches is a grave scandal. Let me suppose that some visitant from a distant planet, or, not to exceed the bounds of probability, some stranger from a

land neither European nor Christian, should come to study the conditions of European life, on the spiritual side especially. Let me suppose, too, that he should draw up a report upon those conditions in the spirit of Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* or of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*. Would he not insist with astonishment, if not with indignation, upon the fact that Christians who profess the same faith, who worship the same God, who adore the same Lord and Master, yet do not and will not worship together, but sometimes fly at each other's throats, treat each other as aliens and heretics, and set an example of that theological hatred which has been and still is the bane of religion in all human history?

The man of the world laughs at the contrast between Christian profession and Christian practice; and when the Church cries aloud, "Sirs, ye are brethren," he is apt to reply, "Wilt thou kill me as thou didst the Egyptian yesterday?"

Again, the disunion of the Churches is a great weakness. It goes far to paralyse the moral influence of the Churches themselves. The adversaries of Christianity have scornfully remarked that the Church of Jesus Christ

counted for little or nothing at the outbreak of the Great War, and that she too counts for little or nothing since the war in the arena of industrial controversy. But how can the Church or the Churches preach peace, when at the time of preaching it they make themselves ready for battle? How can they impress upon Labour and Capital the duty of recourse to pacific arbitration, when they are fighting among themselves? How can they demand or expect that the nations of the world should settle their disputes by reference to the League of Nations, if nothing will induce them to abandon recriminations and reprisals in their own affairs? The first step which, as it seems to me, must be taken, if Jesus Christ is to be made again the Lord of Christendom, is that the Churches should close up their ranks. It is only when the Churches speak with one voice, as they believe with one soul, that they can render true, effective service to the causes of righteousness such as temperance, purity and peace.

Thirdly, the disunion of the Churches is a violation of our Lord's own prayer that His disciples might be one, *i.e.* one body, as He and His Father are one. If He still in His infinite

compassion deigns to sympathise with the distresses and disappointments of His children, what must be His feeling when, in defiance of His solemn and final petition, He sees the seamless robe of His Church rent into fragments, besmirched and defiled by the bitterness and violence of Christians who profess His name but forget or ignore His spirit?

I say then, and I cannot help saying, however regretfully, that the Churches, so long as they maintain their present attitude of suspicion and exclusion, are guilty of disloyalty to their Divine Master, and that they cannot expect the fullness of His benediction, nor can they successfully accomplish the mission with which He has entrusted them.

What then is the desirable end in Christian reunion and how is it attainable?

There is a reunion which implies the conformity of all Churches to the obedience of one Church. That is the Roman Catholic idea of reunion. In the language recently used by a Roman Catholic priest, "reunion means submission." It means that all Churches and all Christians shall consent to accept the infallible authority of the Pope.

For my own part I do not anticipate, and I

do not appreciate, such reunion. History, I think, if it teaches any lesson, teaches that the Church, when she was undivided, became corrupt. Protestantism has at least rendered to the Church of Rome the service of making the Pope a respectable citizen. The claim of the Church of Rome depends upon a number of propositions which are not the less dubious because they are vehemently and repeatedly asserted. The relation of St. Peter to the origin of the Church of Rome, the relation of the Church of Rome in early days to the Catholic Church of Christ, the prerogative, not only spiritual but political, of the Papacy, the reality of the so-called Apostolical succession, these are questions so disputable that it is perilous, or at the best precarious, to constitute a particular view of them or of any one of them as the test of a true Christianity. Far better is it that Christians should unite on the basis of the truths which are held by them all in common, such as the Articles of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds.

It is frequently asserted that Roman Catholics in the matter of religious faith all think alike. But, if people think alike, the

reason is that they do not think at all. If people think at all, they will differ; and although differences, if they exceed a certain measure, are incompatible with the unity of a Church, yet, where no differences exist, there is no life.

The Reformation then, in spite of all its faults, was the greatest event, as Froude has called it, in human history, because it established once for all the principle of freedom—freedom of thought, of religious belief, of public meeting, and of divine worship. The Church of Rome, when her members are a minority, may avail herself of the religious freedom which she would, if she could, deny to others; but if ever she gains the upper hand, religious freedom will not exist or will not long continue. It is not long since Pope Pius IX could point to the unhappy Republic of Ecuador as the only State governed in accordance with the will or the spirit of the Holy See.

Let me say then frankly that at the present time all such overtures as are made by Lord Halifax or by other Anglo-Catholics to the Church of Rome for reconciliation or reunion are idle and futile; they only recoil on the

English Churchmen who make them; they only bring insult upon the Church in whose name they are made. If ever in the Providence of God there should come to pass a great federation of the Church of England and the Anglican Church all over the world with the orthodox Church or Churches of the Near East, and with the Reformed Evangelical Churches, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, of Great Britain and continental Europe, then at last, but not I believe until then, might the Church of Rome, if confronted with an organisation not less Catholic and more Christian than her own, begin to think of approaching the other Christian Churches or of allowing them to approach her upon terms of practical or theoretical equality.

But if it is impossible to look for reunion with the Church of Rome in the West, there is light, I think, on the Eastern horizon. May I ask you to consider the position of the orthodox Church or Churches? They have enjoyed an unbroken ecclesiastical history during fifteen centuries; they have never acknowledged the supremacy of the Papal See; they have never been united or associated, as the Church

of England once was, with the Church of Rome; they are separated from the Churches of the West by an actual difference of Creed in regard to the Procession of the Holy Spirit; yet they are national Churches like the Church of England; they are Episcopal Churches like the Church of England; they are actuated, not by the spirit of exclusion so much as by the spirit of reunion; and if the Church of England holds out the right hand of fellowship to them they are willing, not only informally but officially, to accept it. I need not remind you that the Churches of the Near East have for some time past welcomed clergymen of the Church of England to the offices of their worship, and have permitted and encouraged their priests to take part in the offices of worship in the Church of England. I need not remind you that the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, speaking in behalf of their Churches, have lately recognised the validity of Anglican Orders. There can be little doubt, I hold, that the ordeal of persecution through which the Church of Russia is now passing will inspire in her faithful sons and daughters a growing appreciation of the sympathy

which the Church of England, especially through the Archbishop of Canterbury, has evinced towards their Church. It is no less my hope than my prayer that, when the present tyranny is overpast, the Church of Russia, rising into new life with all the power which martyrdom inspires, will be ready and eager to enter into intercommunion on definite terms with the Church of England. I speak not altogether without knowledge; for I am a member of the committee which has been formed at the instance of the Archbishop of Canterbury to promote a good understanding with the Churches of the Near East.

But after all reunion, like charity, should begin at home; and the Church of England naturally turns to the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland as living at her side, and to the non-Episcopalian Churches of England as not only living beside her but as having sprung from her, with an inexpressible desire for intercommunion and in the end for reunion. As everybody knows, the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican communion at Lambeth Palace made in August 1920 certain definite and explicit proposals for healing the wounds of English-speaking Christendom.

They proposed that the ministers of the non-Episcopalian Churches should, for the purpose of officiating fully and freely in the churches of the Church of England, accept the commission which the clergy themselves receive through the Episcopate, and that the clergy, and even the Bishops themselves, should receive whatever commission might be held to be necessary for the purpose of officiating fully and freely in churches other than those of the Church of England. You and I may feel some disappointment, I honestly confess I do feel it, as we realise how little has been done in the three eventful years since the publication of the Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference to effect reunion or even intercommunion between the Church of England and the other Churches.

It may be worth while to specify the facts which have militated against the hope of Christian reunion. There are, of course, both within and without the Church, persons who are the avowed or unavowed opponents of reunion, who exult in separation and isolation, who do not desire to consolidate the Reformed Churches, who delight in thinking that they themselves are right and everybody

else is wrong. But, apart from these intractable persons, the Presbyterians, who have always set a high value upon their own Orders, are not unnaturally reluctant to receive what seems to them not only a new commission but a re-ordination. May I not add that as Scotsmen they do not perhaps welcome the thought of getting less than the better in a bargain? Then there are the English Nonconformists, who bear a conscious or unconscious ill-will to the Church, who look upon her more or less as unclean because of her association with the State, and who usurp the name of Free Churchmen, as other people usurp the name of free thinkers, supposing that nobody can think freely who does not think as they do, and that nobody can enjoy a free ecclesiastical life who does not live after their example. It must be admitted too, however sorrowfully, that the Evangelicals of the Reformed Churches have been greatly distressed by the Anglo-Catholic spirit in the Church of England. They believe that the secret of England's greatness lies in the Reformation, and they ask themselves, if they become members of the Church of England, where is the Church

of England going to lead them? I must honestly say I respect and endorse that feeling.

Yet the need of reunion, or at least of intercommunion, has become imperative. I do not imagine that the Churches will surrender or compromise their several principles. I do not wish Churchmen at this time to become Nonconformists, or Nonconformists to become Churchmen. What I do hope is, if I may use Rowland Hill's figure, that the barriers between them will be lowered, so as to allow the two parties to shake hands over them—in other words, that clergymen and ministers will qualify themselves to officiate in each other's churches, and that the intercommunion of Churchmen and Nonconformists will no longer be treated as unusual and unnatural, but will come to be an event of every day.

It was my hope that some corporate action might be found to be possible. Perhaps the opportunity for such action came, if it did come, at or just after the time of the Lambeth Conference; it may, alas! have vanished to-day. I no longer see the possibility of the Churches effecting intercommunion by some definite and collective action. But is it not

possible that a clergyman of the Church of England or a minister of one of the Nonconformist Churches might be permitted, without any sacrifice of his position in his own Church, to qualify himself, if he wished to qualify himself, by the acceptance of a new commission for the power not only of preaching and praying but of celebrating Holy Communion in churches other than those of his own denomination? If that policy could be adopted, there would be no breach of continuity. Nobody would seek the new commission unless he wished for it; nobody would be compelled, if he did not desire, to welcome a clergyman or minister who had accepted the new commission to his church. The Churches themselves would remain untouched, the schools would remain untouched, the organisations of the Churches would remain unaffected; all that would happen would be that the first step towards regular intercommunion would have been taken, and when once it had been taken, though only by a few clergymen and ministers, their example would, I believe, be followed by an ever-growing number of clergymen and ministers, until the Church should no longer be torn by

her inveterate divisions, but would present to the world the spectacle of a unity accordant with the heart of her Divine Master.

It may be—God grant it shall be—that the very danger which now threatens the Churches will under Providence prove a motive to intercommunion. If the paucity of candidates for the ministry of the Churches becomes worse, or even if it becomes no worse than it is now, they will no longer be able to indulge in the luxury, as I may call it, of rival sanctuaries and rival services. No longer will three churches indistinguishable in doctrine and ritual, and all half empty of worshippers, be planted in the villages of Scotland; no longer will churches and chapels be multiplied far beyond all legitimate spiritual needs in the rural districts of England. Churchmen will be constrained, as they are in India and sometimes in the colonies, to accept the ministry of Nonconformists, and Nonconformists of Churchmen, because it will be financially impossible to maintain more churches than one; and if that is the consequence of the present unwillingness to take Holy Orders, then the gain will be greater than the loss. So will God bring good out of evil.

So will He make His Church wiser and wider, by the diminution in the number of her ordained ministers. I ask your earnest, constant, united intercessions for the ultimate attainment of that ideal. At all events I set before you in this solemn week of Evangelical devotion the ideal which lies nearest to my heart. It is the federation of the Reformed non-Roman Churches in one great world-wide League in which every Church shall possess the strength of sympathy with the life of its own nation, yet every Church shall subordinate its nationality by intercommunion, and at the last, please God, by reunion, to the spiritual unity of the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ. I pray God that I may see that ideal realised, or its realisation drawing near, before I die.

II. CHRIST ITS LIFE

By Canon H. A. Wilson, M.A. (Rector of Cheltenham)

I AM charged with a very weighty and solemn duty, and a great responsibility, in turning your attention to one of the highest and yet deepest and most sacred aspects of the whole of this great question of Christian Unity. I have been asked to speak to you about an aspect of Christian Unity which I often think is liable to be forgotten in the great cry which is going up for the reunion of the Churches. The grounds on which that plea for unity is based are many—the wasted energies through overlapping; the scandals of our divisions; the need for an effective witness of the Church both in our social, our national, our political and our international life. I am not going to deal with any one of these. They are all reasons of the profoundest importance. But I shall dwell upon one reason more vital than all others, the reason which I venture to think includes all these others and which is put in the forefront by our blessed Lord and Master.

Let us go, then, first of all, to the great classical passage, so full of sacred and tender associations, in which our Saviour made His appeal to that little group of men in the upper room at Jerusalem, which was by and by to be consolidated by the indwelling power of His Spirit into that Divine society which we call the Christian Church, "the Church of God which He purchased with His precious blood." The shadow of the evening was beginning to fall when Jesus began to speak to His disciples words which seem to-day the tenderest and the most comforting words which ever fell from His blessed lips. You remember where they come—in the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of St. John's Gospel. There He spoke to His friends with the shadow of death falling upon His heart, and the gloom of depression falling on theirs—words of the deepest solemnity, precious words which now gained an entrance that had often been denied to words that He had spoken to them in days and months gone by. The disciples are lifted up into the heavenly places, they are nearer God in spirit than ever before. Then, at the close of His discourse with them, the heart

of the Divine Lord burst forth into prayer to His Heavenly Father. Never was there a moment more tremendously sacred in the life of those disciples than that moment, when they heard the Lord in prayer with His Heavenly Father. I often think that if you and I had been privileged to see that wonderful scene, we should have seen those disciples prostrate on the ground as their Master prayed. This is part of what He said: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe through their word." That means you and me. Jesus Christ in that moment of tremendous sacredness was praying for us. "That they all may be one; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Here are words which should be written deep upon the heart and life of every Christian man and woman.

As the disciples heard those words in sacred awe, the words which Jesus had just spoken to them gained a new and a richer meaning. They saw that they were called not only as individuals to exult in the consciousness of their own salvation, and in the wonderful

gift of their intercourse with God through Jesus Christ; but they saw now, as never before, that they were called as a society to do something in the world, to fulfil a great purpose, to reveal the life which was to dwell within them, a life which would weld them together into one body. If you recall the other words which Jesus had spoken to His disciples, you will remember how twice He had pleaded that they should love one another—"This is my commandment, that ye love one another"; "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another." Though they understood not fully what He meant, He went on to tell them of the Holy Spirit Who was soon to come to dwell within them individually and as a body.

Then He gave them a parable—and it is upon that parable that I want to dwell for a few moments—a simple picture, which every child could grasp, of the deepest things they needed to remember—the parable of the Vine. "I am the vine; ye are the branches." Let us think of that for a moment. Picture to yourselves a vine with its widespread branches. There is the great parent stem which supplies the life to the whole. You can easily over-

look it, because the branches are widespread and they are heavily laden with leaves. But though the great bulk of the growth fills the eye, an instant's perception will show you that the thing that really matters is the parent stem. Cut off this branch and it is at once virtually dead. It will retain a show of life for a few hours, but if you put it in the hot sun it will soon wither and show you that it has no life in itself; it will shrivel to death. It is vitally dependent on the root, for all the life of the vine comes from that parent stem.

Examine the vine. There are side branches, there are leaves, there are twigs and tendrils, and fruit-buds. Every one of them has an office to perform of its own, but every one is absolutely and utterly dependent upon the root for its life. So, says our Lord, is the Church. It exists to express His life simply and solely; that is its one and final purpose. The green leaves, tendrils, twigs and fruit-buds—they are all members of that one vine, but through every one of them pulses the life-giving stream, the life which comes from the vine itself. The vine which is all branches is no good, the vine which is all leaves is no good, the vine which is all tendrils is no good.

What a lesson there is for us all there. I am not going to draw out these thoughts at length, but I want just to put before you what are the three outstanding thoughts that our Lord teaches us in that parable, and every one of them is of vital importance for us constantly to remember in this great matter which is filling our attention to-day. First, the fact that the Church exists to display to the world the life which is indwelling, *i. e.* the life of the Lord of the Church. Christ is its life. Secondly, the diversity of gifts which the various members of the Church possess. Thirdly, that, as all the members are united to the same Source of life, so they are all united to one another.

Will you turn from our Lord's illustration of the Church to St. Paul's? At once you notice the perfect agreement there is between the two. Let me read to you a few verses from the twelfth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, . . . and have been all made to drink into one

Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. . . . Now are they many members, yet but one body. . . . And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Will you notice very briefly how there St. Paul is telling his readers, by the use of his own illustration, the same great truths which our Lord tells us in His illustration of the vine?

First, notice that the body is one. There is but one Church. We may speak in conventional language of the Christian Churches; but there is only one Church, "the blessed company of all faithful people." Much has been said about the "notes of a true Church." It is a remarkable thing, to mark the contrast between what theologians have written upon the "notes" of a true Church and what the Bible tells us are the real tests of a Church. In the Bible the tests of a Church are love, the indwelling power of the Spirit, and union with God's spiritual life. It is upon these things that we must lay our stress if we would be true to the teaching of our Lord and His apostles. Again, St. Paul's words single out

and emphasise the variety of the powers which various members of the body possess. The eye, the hand, the ear—each has its office, and none can be dispensed with; each one has something to contribute to the general well-being of the whole, each one has its own function to perform. By his power of sarcasm —and I know nowhere else where St. Paul is so sarcastic as he is in this chapter—by his power of sarcasm he points out how perfectly hopeless would be the confusion in the body, if the members quarrelled one with the other. "If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him." Might we not dare to paraphrase that as follows: If the whole were Anglicans, if the whole were Presbyterians, if the whole were Methodists, how great would the loss be! We have each one our gifts to give, we have each one our contri-

bution to make, and the union for which we look is not that union which will mean the obliteration of the characteristic marks and individuality of this or that Church, but a union which will be realised when " the kings of the earth bring their honour and glory " into the united Church of Christ. I need not follow out the whole of this in detail. These observations that I have made are commonplace observations. But I sometimes think that we are living in days when the things that least need to be said are the unusual things, and the things which need to be enforced are plain, obvious, fundamental facts which we all suppose we know, but very few of us think upon sufficiently.

Finally, I want you to notice in St. Paul's wonderful picture that it is to a body that he likens the Church. Will you think for a moment what your body is? Your body is the means whereby you express yourself in the world in which you are living. Your body is not you. You are much greater than your body. You dwell in your body. You use your body as an instrument by which you communicate yourself. Your thoughts, your ideas, your hopes, your aspirations—

all these things are materialised into action through your body. Therefore, when we speak of the Church as the body of Christ, that is precisely what we mean. It is through His Body, His Church, that Christ manifests Himself in the world to-day. That is a tremendous thought—that Jesus Christ is still incarnate in His Church to-day, just as He was in the days of His ministry long ago. He is still incarnate in His Church, for He is the life of His Church.

But, just as it often is with the human body when a member is paralysed and is unable to obey the behests of the head, so, alas !—God forgive us—it is in the Body of Christ to-day. There are members of that Body of Christ who are acting upon their own responsibility, out of union with one another, out of unity and obedience with the Head. Therefore, Christ cannot express Himself effectively in this world of our own time, which is crying out for His message and help and presence as perhaps never before in the world's history. The fault is ours. The life of Christ cannot be manifested in a paralysed Body, or in a Body where the members refuse to obey the behests of the

Head. God give His Church the willing spirit, God make it to realise that its sole vocation is simply to be the means whereby Christ's indwelling life—without any protest, without any argument or dispute—can freely and fully manifest itself in the world and in the life of to-day.

III. THE GOSPEL ITS SAFEGUARD

By the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton

It is impossible to deny that there is a certain ambiguity about the title of the subject upon which I am to speak. To test the matter I put it before a confirmed Denominationalist yesterday, and when I told him that I was going to speak upon Christian Unity and the Gospel as its safeguard, "Yes," he said, "a safeguard against Christian Unity;" which was not quite what I intended or what you intend. But really he had in his mind Christian Union when he spoke about Christian Unity. When we come to think of Christian unity as already achieved in Jesus Christ and by God's Spirit, we shall be quite clear that we need safeguards against dangers that are likely to threaten it. No safeguard can be necessary where there is no menace, and I suggest to you that there are four dangers that threaten Christian unity which can only be safeguarded as we take a firm hold of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The first is the tendency to schism. We often think that partisanship and prejudice are the same as principle; sometimes we mistake our preferences for loyalty, and we imagine that our opinions are convictions. It is not always wrong to separate one from the other. There have been cases in the Christian Church when men have been so thoroughly convinced of a certain aspect of truth, and have been unable to bear witness to it in any other way than by separating from those who, while they were Christians, were not able to accept that particular tenet. I am not a Wesleyan, but I cannot imagine that there was any other action possible to Wesley than that he took at the time he took it. We are not to imagine that all separation is schism; but we must not condone the light way in which we have known people to separate, the one from the other, for almost contemptible reasons. Mr. Spurgeon used to speak about a man whom he knew who was constantly changing his church, and he met him one day and said to him, "What are you now?" The man said, "Let me see. What was I last time I saw you?" That kind of easy way of going from one body of

Christ's Church to another cannot commend itself to any of us. Yet, on the other hand, we must remember that not all the error is heresy. I wish some of my friends to-day would get hold of that—that it is quite possible that a thing that you believe is true, while a thing that another man believes, which seems quite contrary to your particular idea, is not false. There may be a third truth that may reconcile the two which seem to oppose each other.

This tendency to separation that is in all of us at times—for there are some people whom, though we love, we never can like, at least, on earth—this tendency is safeguarded by the Gospel; because there is only one Saviour, and if any of us are saved it is because He saved us. You remember, John Baptist sent to our Lord the question, "Art Thou He that should come, or look we for another?" that is to say, "Look we for a second?" I think John had in his mind that Jesus was true, but that perhaps someone was coming to complete the work He had begun. But there is no second, there is only one Saviour, and if we are saved men and women we owe all our salvation to Jesus

Christ. There is only one Lord, and if we belong to Him, then sooner or later we must come into obedience to His commands.

But, I must confess, it passes my comprehension how to-day some people who are Christians, and desire to honour their Master, speak in almost malicious terms of their fellow-Christians because they do not agree with them in some points which are, after all, non-essential. I think we ought, as Christians, to be able to agree to disagree on some of these minor points; but, anyhow, we ought to be able to treat each other as gentlemen.

It is a very difficult thing for privileged people to understand the position of unprivileged people. It is a very difficult thing to bear with meekness, for instance, patronage and contempt, just as it is a very difficult thing to bear with charity, ignorance and rudeness; and we have been familiar with both of these things within the limits of the Christian Church.

I would like to say, again, that it is a very difficult thing for a man with a broad mind to understand a man with a narrow mind. I was out in Australia a while ago, and at a

meeting in Adelaide I ventured to say that a broad man who will have nothing to do with a narrow man is narrower than a narrow man who will have nothing to do with a broad man. They could not take that in all at once, and someone got up and said, "Will you say that again?" I said I thought it was self-evident that a broad man who would have nothing to do with a narrow man is narrower than a narrow man who would have nothing to do with a broad man; because a broad man ought to be broad enough to embrace all, while a narrow man, because of his very narrowness, could be excused if he did not embrace his broad brother. Here again the Gospel is a safeguard. It is the Gospel of grace, and grace ought to bridge the difference between one Christian and another. Not one of us is a Christian but by grace. The man who is separate from the world by grace must be so like every other man that knows grace, that the difference between the recipient of grace and those who are in the world and know it not, is infinitely smaller than the difference between one Christian man and another. I have heard some of my fellow-Christians say, "We are saved by

grace, but we are going to be rewarded by-and-by by works." I only hope I shall not be rewarded by my works. I am quite content to be rewarded by grace, as I have been saved by grace. So the Gospel safeguards this danger of separation and schism. When we know it well enough, as Wesley did, who wrote :

> " Names, and sects, and parties fall,
> Thou, O Christ, art all in all."

The second danger that threatens unity is the liability to compromise. It is a fashionable thing in these days to say that " We will split the difference." That, of course, is a very good thing sometimes. If you want to make peace, compromise is often essential. And there are things in the Church of Christ that may well be compromised. I am able to say, with a Bishop in the chair, that it might be a matter for compromise whether we should have liturgy or free prayer in our services, or whether we should have both. There are many other things on which we might well compromise. It really does not matter whether a minister of the Gospel buttons his collar at the front or at the back,

nor whether he wears a black tie or a white one or none at all.

But there are some things in the Christian faith where compromise is utterly impossible. We cannot compromise on the truth of the Gospel, we cannot compromise on the fact of Christ's Deity, we cannot compromise on the great Atonement; and with the Cross continually before us we shall be saved from any idea of compromise, because it, and it alone, sets us free. We cannot in the Christian faith compromise between self and Christ. Our trust in Him must be so true that He is everything. We cannot compromise between "All of self, and none of Thee," or "None of self, and all of Thee," by saying "We will have some of self and some of Thee."

When I was out in China, one day I was walking along one of the country roads in a far inland province with a companion. We thought we knew our road, but we came to a fork in the way, and were nonplussed. Hitherto we had been guided by the single telegraph wire, but the telegraph wire was now between the two roads. Fortunately, there was a Chinese gentleman in a cart in front. He had taken the left road. We

went up to him, and in our elementary Chinese told him we were going to a certain city, and asked him if the road on the right was the way there. He got down from his cart, and greeting us most courteously said that his honourable brethren had made a most excellent choice. We ventured to ask where our honourable father was going, and he said he was going to the same city. We suggested that perhaps we had better go the way as he. He bowed and said that his same honourable brethren had made a most excellent choice. His politeness prevented him from giving us clear and accurate direction. I suggest that we must not be so enamoured of Christian unity, or so polite to each other, or so afraid of offending each other, that we compromise Christian truth.

The third danger that threatens Christian unity is the easy way of uniformity. We are so liable to slip into it, from sheer laziness, by the mimicry innate in us all, each trying to be like another, until we become like so many eggs in a basket, one shape and size and colour, until we are like Tate's sugar, all of one size and pattern, and not like Tate's Picture Gallery, with a splendid variety of

pictures painted by different artists. Uniformity is not to be desired. We want to let life assert itself. In winter as you go along the road you see that country cottars have cut down their evergreens to one conventional pattern—a Dutch cheese, or an ox, or a peacock. But the returning spring laughs at their aimless labour, the new foliage bursts out into all sorts of fantastic forms. So it must be in the Church of Jesus Christ. There must be room for originality. The Gospel here is our safeguard; it is the great individualiser, it puts value upon the unit, and while we are "all one in Christ Jesus," every man grows in the pattern of the Spirit that he has received, according to the measure of grace that has been ministered unto him.

The final danger to which I would direct your attention is the lure of laxity. The thought of unity suggests that danger, because if we realise that we are united with our fellow-Christians, some of whom are worldly, we begin to think that worldliness, after all, is allowable. The Puritans were not all Separatists, many were members of the Anglican Church. But all Separatists are Puritans. Sometimes it is necessary

to separate in order to avoid what may to us be the unclean thing, but the recognition of unity with those who indulge in lax ways may lead to toleration of evil. How is that to be safeguarded? Not by laws, but by the Gospel, which is not a mere set of laws, not a mere catalogue of negations, but a new and abundant life; then for love to Christ I shall deny myself many things, I shall exercise restraints in order that I may commend Him to people round about me.

A friend of mine on one occasion had some trouble in his home—it was over some Church matter—and one day he drew up five or six rules for his family. He brought them to me for my opinion. I read them, and commended them, and said they were excellent rules—they could not be better; but I added, "Take them and put them in the fire." The home is not regulated by rules, but by love. When you go into a hotel you find rules. The very fact of the rules shows that the people are strangers to each other, and mean to continue strangers. We will never be brought together by rules and regulations. Unity comes when we realise that by the Gospel and the Spirit of Christ we share a common life.

When the chairman was speaking of the Eastern Church and our relation to it, I could not help thinking of the Western Continent, where there are thirty millions of fellow-Christians, and very few Episcopalians among them. What are we to do with them when we are seeking unity? And in this connection I recall that Mr. Silas McBee, himself an honoured member of the Episcopal Church in America, told me of the first meeting of the representatives of his communion after the Civil War. One of the leaders proposed first of all they should determine the conditions on which they could work together. But a wiser man got up and said, "I propose that we postpone that question and we begin to work together." The question has been postponed ever since, The way for Churches to solve their differences is, not to discuss terms on which they are going to work together, but to begin to work together. Do we realise that we are believers in the same Christ, sharers of a common life, going to the same heaven, following the same Lord, saved by the same grace? Do we realise that we are fellow-sinners? Charles Simeon once said, "Our very tears need to be

washed in the blood of Christ." Shall we sinners, saved by the one grace and going along the same way to the same heaven, refuse to work together? Far be that from us. Instead of debating how we shall begin to do it, let us do it.

I am glad to think that some of the clergy are willing to preach in Nonconformist pulpits; they will be welcome there. I am glad to think that Bishop Welldon, our Chairman this afternoon, was one of the first to inaugurate the interchange of pulpits, and to invite a Free Churchman to preach in Durham Cathedral. Let us increase that sort of thing, and we shall find, after a little while, that there are many points now troubling us which we shall not need to discuss at all. Christian unity, which exists in the Spirit, will be manifested before the world, and the world, seeing it, will see that Jesus Christ is sent of the Father, and will follow Him. Then the day when Christ Himself, in some way unguessed perhaps by any of us, but in some glorious way, will be revealed to the world in His mighty epiphany.

In that great book, *The Life and Letters of Walter Page,* who was the American

Ambassador to England just before and during the early years of the war, he tells us that just before the war he went to the Admiralty and saw Jellicoe, who said to him, "The Admiralty never sleeps; why, Mr. Page, I have a telephone beside my bed." Mr. Page, in his quaint American way, said, "And did it ever ring?" Jellicoe looked up quite solemnly and said, "No, but it will." And one night it rang, and the message went from the Admiralty down to Portsmouth that the Fleet was to start, and five minutes afterwards the message came back that the Fleet was off. Did it ever ring? We have talked about Christian unity and the glory of the Gospel, and we long for the day when the kingdom of Christ shall come. But nothing happens. "Did it ever ring?" "No, but it will." Keep awake, and some day the signal shall be given, that shall usher in not a war but the eternal peace—peace between Christian people, and peace between God and the world. So

> "Why should the flock with strife be riven,
> And envious life the Church divide,
> When Christ, the Lord of earth and heaven,
> Stands at the door to claim His Bride?"

IV. PRAYER ITS INSPIRATION

By the Rev. the Hon. W. Talbot Rice, M.A.

In our Lord's great prayer in St. John xvii., in which He renders the account of His life to God, He made several intercessions for His disciples. "Keep them from the evil one"; "Sanctify them in the truth"; "Keep them in Thy Name which Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, even as We are"; and further on He embraces His Church all down the ages—those who believe on Him through the apostolic testimony—"that they all may be one." And He concludes with the prayer, "Father, I will that, where I am, they also may be with Me; that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me."

It is a fourfold prayer—for deliverance, for holiness, for unity, and for vision. The power of His might, the truth of His word, the fullness of His fellowship, the abounding goodness of God's grace shall bring these things to pass.

We are concerned here with one of these four petitions. The words on the lips of men to-day throughout Christendom are brotherhood, peace, fellowship. The broken, jarring, destructive and selfish relationships of men are manifest to all. The fact of selfishness is the biggest and ugliest that meets us everywhere. The heart of man that cries for love and reconciliation is met by division and discord. The ravages wrought by sin, and its horrible character, are most clearly seen in its divisive forces, in clashing wills and hostile interests and personal and selfish ambitions. Separations work in the nation, among the nations, and in the Church. And yet, to the praise of God's Spirit of truth and peace be it said, the passion amongst men of goodwill, in the Church and in the nations, is for unity, for co-operation and for peace, in a new, widespread and hopeful way.

Human suffering in war and peace, the hope of progress, the fear of darker disasters, the awakening of the Churches to their weakness in the presence of the tremendous needs of the world, the revelation of the will of God and the pondering of the prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ have stirred men's desires and wills

towards the way of sacrifice and service and love.

I am asked to suggest to you that we have missed the way through forgetting that prayer is the inspiration of unity; and that the attitude of heart and mind and will and life involved in prayer is the only really hopeful and effective power for the fellowship on earth.

Let me call your attention to the contents of our Lord's prayer for unity. He knew the sad and terrible story of heresies, persecutions, divisions, the harsh judgments, the cruel suspicions, the false witness, narrowness, and bigotry that would be; and He knew there was only one remedy—and that the turning of the heart and mind of man to God and to Himself. Earth's broken fellowship with all its horrors was due to the separation of man from the love and life and will of God.

"Let them look at Thee and Me," He prays, "that they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee."

"Let them be in Us," in a fellowship that means union, that they may be one. "Let them restore Me to the place of the King of Love within them." "I in them that they

may be perfected into Me." Let them realise their poverty and weakness and loss, their craving and hunger and thirst for satisfaction, and receive "the glory which Thou gavest Me." "I have given it to them, that they may be one as We are one"; and let them realise that unity can only come by personal character transformed, so that "they may be perfected into Me."

If unity "after Christ" is to be, is it not clear from this prayer that the one supreme need of the hour is that attitude of the soul of man that turns to God, to behold Him, to trust and love Him, to yield to Him, to receive of Him, and to submit to the mighty working of His power upon us?

Our Lord is ending His earthly life in this troubled, warring world, and as He does it He directs His mind to God and bids His disciples do likewise, and follow the guidance of His holy and saving prayer. Let us follow His thought and His teaching, and so be led into the oneness for which He prayed.

1. He turns us to God Himself. The unity of God, like the peace of God and the love of God, is to fill mind, imagination and desire. God the Father and God the Son are one:

one in essence, in life, in love, in will. The eternal Son of God is the perfect Son in all the fullest and deepest meaning of eternal Sonship. "I and My Father are one." He is the only begotten of the Father, the express image of the Father. This perfect relationship has been manifested in time and on earth; the oneness has been manifested so that "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

How shall we see this effectively but in the attitude of prayer, adoration, worship? And, further, the perfection of oneness is manifested in the perfect self-giving of both, a thing which we can understand. "God so loved that He gave His only begotten Son," and "Christ loved me and gave Himself for me." Redemption's most wonderful story is the story of the eternal Father and the eternal Son acting in one to save mankind and me.

There is a perfect unity in eternity, and perfect unity in manifestation among us of God the Father and God the Son. Let imagination, desire and thought dwell upon it in prayer and meditation.

2. Our Lord's prayer is that "they may be in Us." In the Father and in the Son.

Fellowship in thought is to lead on to the wonderful fellowship in union. God imparts Himself. By great and precious promises we are made "partakers of the Divine Nature." The heart that loves Jesus Christ loves Him who is love—loves His character, desires it, seeks for it, and will find it as the prayer goes up.

"Thy nature, gracious Lord, impart,
Come quickly from above,
Write Thy new name upon my heart,
Thy new, best name of love."

Separation from God has worked the further catastrophe of selfishness and separation from one another. In union with God lies the way of repair, and restoration and the cessation of earth's hostilities.

The sons of God, like the only begotten Son of God, share in a real sense the Father's life, for they "have the Son." Restored sonship leads to restored brotherhood. There is no other way. Brotherhood is only possible in the family, and to belong to the Family of God in the Kingdom of God—for His Family is a Kingdom wide as the world—we must share the life of God.

How can this be but by the attitude of believing prayer? The soul must seek,

aspire, retire into God, and finding in the sacrifice of Calvary its right, and assured by it of a welcome, open itself wholly to the inflowing flood of the grace of the Father in the Son. Power for unity will thus be received in prayer.

3. Our Lord further prays for our unity in these words :

" I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one." The Presence of Jesus Christ within man, His reign in the inmost being, subdues man to Himself. Christ in us is Christ as King over us. Unity among men depends upon His reign in men. It is the one and the same Christ Who is to reign in each believer. The great passion of the soul of each should be for this indwelling. The first and chief aim is not to have a Christ defined in words, or acknowledged in creeds, served in rites, ceremonies, sacraments, or ordinances, but a Christ who " liveth in me." The soul must seek Him, learn of Him, hear His words, study Him, receive Him, let His mind of obedience, trust and self-surrender and self-sacrifice engross it. The Christ of the Synoptists, the man Christ Jesus ; the Christ of St. John manifesting forth His glory, the glory

as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; the Christ of the Epistles, Whose glorious redeeming work reveals Him as sin-bearing Saviour and victorious Deliverer. This gracious Son of Man, God the Son, Saviour-King, must fill the hearts of men if there is to be unity. The way to this life is prayer. The Holy Ghost must take of the things of Christ and show them to us. Our attitude must be the full and glad response of a living, trustful confidence and surrender, which is prayer at its best.

The unity of heaven is the reign of God. Every spirit there glows with the fire of love to God, and is filled with God. The unity of earth waits upon the reign of Christ over all. The unity of the Church depends on the willingness of believers to set themselves fully to fulfil this prayer of Christ, "I in them," by the prayer of faith realising the fact of Christ in *me*, and by fellowship in prayer with others realising the fact of Christ in *us*.

4. Lastly, Christ in prayer says, "The glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them, that they may be one, as We are."

In St. John xiii. in the upper room, we are shown a glimpse of the glory of Jesus.

He came from God and went to God—words which tell of His origin and His destiny. In 1 John iii. 1–3 John speaks of believers in like manner. They are sons of God, they shall be fully like Christ. To their spiritual origin and destiny he refers. In each case the glory leads to action. The glory of His essential Sonship leads Jesus to loving, lowly washing of quarrelling disciples' feet—feet that would flee from Him in a few hours. The glory of the believers' "filial dignity, the state of adoption, whereby they have become what the Son continually is, children of God and objects of His perfect love," leads to holiness.

So Jesus says, "I have given them My glory that they may be one." *Noblesse oblige.* Noble birth makes us "very patient, very kind; knows no jealousy; makes no parade; gives itself no airs; is never rude, never selfish, never irritated, never resentful; is always eager to believe the best, always hopeful, always patient."

"I have given them the glory which Thou gavest Me." Yes, but have they received it? The days that followed the prayer were dark with desertion, denial and doubt, almost with despair. But days of prayer followed in a

little while, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and bound together in a fellowship which has been our ideal ever since.

Let us pray more with these great truths before us. Let us kneel by our Master and pray after Him. Let us remember we are praying according to His will if we take up His own prayer, and that He is interceding for these same things still. And lastly, let us be patient. We have to be "perfected into one." If we dropped all narrow, separating definitions, all old controversies, all differentiating Church governments, we should not be one as He prayed. Unity can only be attained by constantly keeping these great fundamental truths before us, living near to God's will in Christ, yielding daily more and more to His Spirit's influence. We must pray to be led into a deep experience of God in Christ and Christ in us that will make all lesser things take their right place, and never keep us from full and free and frank and fearless fellowship with all who live in Christ and Christ in them.

Our Lord by prayer and precept in His great intercession in John xvii. is ever saying to us, "Lift up your hearts." Let our united response be, "We lift them up unto the Lord," and we shall be perfected into one.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND WORLD EVANGELISATION

I. THEIR ESSENTIAL RELATIONSHIP

By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Bradford

THE very fact that such a subject should be chosen for a gathering like this is a sign of the times. We have travelled a long way from the position of the Christian Church in England when William Carey was called of God to sound a trumpet call to world evangelisation as the primary duty of the Church. Now the very success of missionary effort has compelled us to face the task of reuniting the scattered forces of Christ's army if that work is to proceed to its accomplishment.

It is the need of unity in the Mission field, and the compulsion of that need which has resulted in attempts towards unity, which have focussed our attention on the essential relationship between Unity and World Evangelisation.

1. We know that our missionary efforts are hindered, their appeal weakened, their

results lessened by the Church's lack of unity, and we know too that the growing Church in other lands, faced with its task of evangelisation, feels acutely the necessity for one united Church, and even sets an example to the Home Church in its efforts to compose its differences.

"The need for advance along every line," said Bishop Azariah of Dornakal in his C.M.S. Annual Sermon, 1920, "compels one to contemplate the terrible waste of forces by duplicating men and machinery in some of the fields. We face together the titanic task of winning India for Christ, one fifth of the human race. Yet confronted by such an overwhelming responsibility, we find ourselves rendered weak and comparatively impotent by our unhappy divisions—divisions for which we were not responsible, and which have been imposed upon us from without—divisions which we did not create, and which we do not desire to perpetuate."

"Why are you a Baptist?" The question was asked of a leading Indian layman, and his thought-out answer was, "I am a Baptist not because of theology, but because of geography."

I need give no other illustration of the felt necessity, though I could multiply instances if needed.

2. And this has led to attempts in the foreign field to close up their ranks. Only this morning I read a letter from the Rev. W. E. S. Holland which tells of a most striking example of this. "It is the work of a little group of educated Syrian Christians drawn from all their terribly divided ranks who have had a vision. It is a vision of a teaching fellowship, Indian and indigenous in inspiration and control, of men who will live in common a life of personal discipleship and Christian adventure, working for the unity of the Syrian Churches, and their missionary consecration to the winning of India for Christ." Bishop Gill says of it: "The Alwaye Teaching Fellowship is the finest product of the Indian Church that I have seen. . . . It is *Catholic*, welcoming members from all Churches, thus contributing, by means of a common life lived together by students and staff, towards *future union* among the Churches. . . . It is *Evangelistic* in spirit, because it is deeply Christian and must lead souls to Christ." Here is an example then of the essential

relationship between Unity and World Evangelisation in actual fact. "Nothing but a new life that makes *Christ central*, and girds itself for the overwhelming task of *India's evangelisation* can restore us to a *Christian unity* that sees lesser issues in their unimportance beside Him and India's needs."

The relationship is thus seen to be a *fact*—and it is finding expression in efforts like the United Christian University in Shantung, the Pekin Union Medical College, the South Indian United Church, the Alliance of British Missionary Societies in East Africa which was the outcome of the second Kikuyu Conference, and elsewhere.

3. So, looking from the facts, we turn to see their essential relationship to one another. And one's thoughts are at once led to John xvii. and our Blessed Lord's great prayer for Unity. He prayed that all His disciples might be one, in as close a Unity as that existing between the Father and Himself, "that the *world* may believe that Thou hast sent Me." The marvel of the fellowship possible in Christ Jesus was to be the most convincing witness to the world of His Mission; the Unity of the Church was to be

the proof of the Divine Authority of its Founder.

Further, we have been made increasingly familiar of recent years with the thought, which finds expression in Haggai and St. Paul and Revelation, that the Unity of the Body of Christ can never be completely realised until the world has been evangelised, and "the desirable things of all nations shall come," each making its own proper contribution to the fullness of "the Christ that is to be." Full Unity within the Body of the Church waits on World Evangelisation; World Evangelisation waits on Unity.

Can we go further and understand why this is so? It leads us to an exploration of the very nature of God and His Purpose as revealed by Jesus Christ. For trace either the idea of Unity or World Evangelisation back to its origin, and we find it is in Christ —"whether it be the wonder of fellowship in His Body, or the wonder of the all-embracing Love of God."

In the very nature of God Himself there is Unity and Love. Within the Trinity there is perfect union and perfect love. And that love was not content with the circle of the

Godhead, but showed itself in Creative Act—God so loved that He made the world and all the inhabitants thereof to glorify Him; and though we see not yet His purpose of love in Creation fulfilled, we know that Creation carried with it Redemption in His Purpose of Love—"God so loved that He gave His only begotten Son." And this Redemptive Work, completed once for all in time by the death upon the Cross, has been entrusted to us, His disciples, His Church, His Body, to see it made effective through the whole circle of creation. Thus the essential relationship of Unity and purposeful love for all mankind is seen to belong to the very Being of God Himself.

Is not this brought out most clearly in the Epistle to the Ephesians? What is the mystery that the Apostle has had revealed to him to make known to the world but this, that the Eternal Purpose of God is love for all without distinction, and that through the Church as a unified Body—all barriers broken down by Christ the Reconciler—the unsearchable riches of Christ might become the common property of all mankind?

"Unto me, who am less than the least

of all saints, is this grace given . . . to make all men see what is the dispensation," etc.

We can hardly tell as we read the Epistle which thought was more exalting to the writer—the marvel of the Unity of the One Body in Christ, or the glory and comprehensiveness of the purpose which embraced all nations. The two thoughts are interwoven in the Epistle, and seem not separable to St. Paul: rather they are two aspects of the same truth of the Love of God in Christ Jesus.

To St. Paul the Church is robbed of its glory if it either lack the Unity of One Body, or if it lose sight of the ideal of a Church in which all nations have their place. The love which unites and unifies is the same love which reaches out to the whole world. Are not these both included in the fellowship of the mystery which St. Paul began to understand and to make known?

So to understand their essential relationship leads us back to meditate on the purpose of God in Christ.

"Jesus Christ came to reveal God to our finite understanding. If love and fellowship essentially and absolutely be the nature of

God, what place can disunion and narrowness have among us who are called not only to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect, but also to cause the knowledge of God to cover the earth?"

The love which expresses itself in Unity within the Body, and the out-reaching love which longs to bring all men in, are they not essentially one? For do they not both spring from the God of love, who is Himself eternal Fellowship and who came down to save *all* men? If we lose sight of either ideal, if we mar the Unity of the Church, or narrow its scope, we confuse ourselves, we blur our vision.

Perhaps St. Paul's figure of the body will give us a further thought in understanding this essential relationship. The wholeness of the body is a necessity if it is to fulfil the purpose for which it is designed; and again, active service is a necessity if the body is to retain its wholeness.

"Not only does our disunion give the lie to our relationship to God and one another: it prevents us from fulfilling the chief immediate purpose for which God made us members of His family."

"The gross and patent contradiction by the Christian community of the principal tenet (love) that it preaches and on which it stands: *that* is chiefly what prevents the triumph of the Gospel."

I conclude with a quotation from the Lambeth Appeal, which is really germane to our subject, "*We believe that God wills fellowship.* By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible and united Society, holding one Faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

"The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended, and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought, while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fullness of the life of Christ."

"The battle of the Kingdom." In the Great War the Allies fought splendidly in their own sections as separate units, but the single

enemy were like to win the day. Then a real Unity of Command was attained—one master mind controlled them all and welded them into a real fighting Unity that secured the victory. So in the Greater War one Master Mind must have control—each unit of the Body must acknowledge Him as Leader, and all others as real and vital members one of another—and thus we too as Christ's Army shall be led to victory.

II. THE CALL FROM THE REGIONS BEYOND

By the Rev. J. H. Ritson, D.D.

FROM some points of view the contemplation of the Regions Beyond is by no means cheering. Everywhere we see unrest and struggle. I do not think there is more tribulation in the world to-day than in days that are past. But the tribulation is broadcasted. All nations have to share in the sufferings of each. The increase in the facilities for travel, and in the means of communication, has tightened the bundle of life and made the solidarity of the human race a very real thing; and when one member, however lowly, suffers from any disease—economic, social, moral—the whole body of the human race is infected. This was not the case when the nations of the world were isolated one from another by continents and oceans. The contraction of the world, the bringing together of all nations into intimate

contact, has brought us into a situation vastly more perplexing than any known to our forefathers.

Let us cast our eyes for a few moments over the Regions Beyond, and note some of the problems of our day and generation in which we are involved. Look at Europe, the greatest and the saddest problem of all. Since the Apostle Paul obeyed the vision of the man of Macedonia, Europe has been the historic base of the Christian Church. The Christian continent! And the non-Christian world has just been watching us bury ten millions of the flower of manhood on our fields of battle; and they are still watching us as we are engaged in internecine strife. The strain between Germany and France makes us feel very fearful for the future. The new countries which have found independence in the centre of Europe are establishing around themselves a ring fence: they are animated by a nationalism which has no international outlook. The Balkan States are not fighting, because either they dare not or they cannot. Turkey defies our Western civilisation; and Russia is in the grip of a system which defies God as well as man. In Eastern Europe we

have ten millions of Jews, greater in their power for good or evil than any other ten million people on the face of the earth.

Turn for a moment to Asia, covering half the human race. Look at the Bible lands. I was in Nazareth a few weeks ago, and saw the fountain from which it is practically certain Joseph and Mary and Jesus drew their water. On that fountain to-day there is a great sign-board stating the speed limit for motor cars and the notice is printed in English, in Arabic, and in Hebrew. This is a parable. In the Bible lands we have the meeting of old and new, of East and West, of yellow, white and black. We have the clash of Jew, of Moslem, of Christian, and in every genus we have a number of species; and, midst the turmoil of conflicting interests, Great Britain is called upon to provide a guiding hand and mind and heart, to give a home and a national centre to the Jews.

Think of India, where a burden of an entirely different kind is laid upon the British. Our problem in India is the problem of parents, foster parents it may be, but parents with a real responsibility, parents who want to see their children self-determining, filling

their rightful sphere in the affairs of the human race, but not daring to remove all restraints until the children have the wisdom and the power and the experience to walk alone. It is a tremendous responsibility. Remember, it is a family of three hundred millions of people, speaking hundreds of different languages mutually unintelligible, with great varieties of religion and in many stages of civilisation.

And glance at China, embracing a quarter of the human race. On the future destinies of the Chinese the world depends. China to-day is like a mighty ship, the biggest afloat, out on a stormy sea, and with no strong man at the wheel, in danger itself of foundering and with all sorts of peril to every other vessel afloat. It has been said, I believe, by a Japanese soldier, "Give me liberty in China, and I will raise an army of forty million men"—and there is no more virile people in the world than the Chinese—"and I will arm them with modern weapons."

Japan has leaped into the forefront of all the nations, but is materialistic. And as long as materialism prevails, she is like the image in the Prophecy—"gold, silver, brass,

iron, but with feet part of clay"; and if Japan falls she cannot fall alone.

What too shall we say of Africa, those two hundred millions of backward children of the race? God made them, God made them black. But their rights, their God-given rights, have never been recognised. Just because they are ignorant, just because they are infinitely split up by tribal and linguistic differences, they have been oppressed by the dominant race and forced to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the rest of mankind. But a change is coming. A monument was recently unveiled to Booker T. Washington, I think, at Tuskegee. He is represented as removing the veil from a stalwart negro who sits at his feet. By the side of the negro are symbols of the Arts and Industries, and on the knees of the negro an open book. The black man is at school, he is learning to read, learning to think, beginning to resent the domination that is unjust, growing into self-consciousness and learning the secret of cohesion. If we do not give it to him he will demand by sheer weight of numbers his place in the sun. I once heard it said, "We shall never have the harmonies of

the kingdom of heaven upon earth until we learn to play on the black keys as well as the white."

And South America, with its paganism, and a good deal of paganised Christianity—I am not exaggerating—has claims upon us which no Monroe Doctrine can ever cancel. No politician can ever make void the great commission of our Lord and Master; and we in Great Britain have responsibilities in South America which we can never hand over to our brethren in the United States without betraying the great trust.

If we look more widely from the nations and continents to the races—and I cannot dwell upon this—in the present situation in the world there are the seeds of an appalling conflict between black and yellow and white, which, if it should eventuate, will make every cataclysm through which we have passed pale into insignificance.

I say, from some points of view the contemplation of the Regions Beyond is by no means cheering. We often hear it said in these days that this is a new world, and a survey of the nations, however brief and superficial, shows that there is a good deal that is

new. But, if we look deeper and look longer, we find it is the old world with which we are still dealing. Human nature has not changed. The unrest and the struggle assume new forms, but they are symptoms of the same old disease. Sin in the human heart is at the root of all the troubles in the Regions Beyond, and indeed here at home.

For what do these Regions call? Let us make no mistake. They do not want the things they need. We who know Christ, who have had experience of the forgiveness of sin by our Saviour, and who have entered into the joy and the power of the new life in Christ —we know what they need, but they don't. Did you read that article in one of the London evening papers—I think it was last autumn —by the Dean of St. Paul's, on the toll of life taken by the recent War? When I read it I got out a pencil and a piece of paper, and tried to add up the total of the lives lost directly and indirectly through the War. I reached 55,000,000, and I had not got to the end. I was with one of the staff of the Bible Society, an Armenian, a few weeks ago, and met his mother and his child. They were altogether, with their relatives, a family of sixty two or

three years ago, and the three I met are the only three left; the rest have died or been massacred. Fifty-five millions lost! And treaties only seem to change the nature of the strife, and academic discussions of international relationships move very, very slowly.

On Armistice Day, November 11, at eleven o'clock in the morning, I was one of that vast crowd that stood in front of the Mansion House, a crowd disappearing as far as the eye could reach down those streets which radiate from that centre. There came a silence broken only by the flutter of the wings of pigeons alarmed by the maroon. It seemed an age rather than two minutes. It was a silence that could be felt. But at the end of that silence the great gathering broke out—and it seemed spontaneous—into—

> "O God, our help in ages past,
> Our hope for years to come."

It is God that this poor world needs. The nations need two things—a moral ideal, and power to reach it. When men are translating the Bible they often come to extraordinary gaps in language. In many a language there is no word for "Peace." The

nearest approach is "cessation from war," but that is not peace. That is the sort of peace we are experiencing to-day. In many a language there is no word for "Forgive." The nearest approach is a word which means "To forget," or "Not to punish." That is not forgiveness. In many a language there is no word for "Mercy," no word for "Fornication," no word for "Right." These gaps in language point to gaps in morality. There are as many codes of morality in the world as there are nations and tribes; and while you have the nations of the world on different levels of morality, you are going to have war.

The other day I went over Chubb's Safe Works in Wolverhampton. I saw a door of the strong-room which weighed, I think, twenty tons, made of manganese steel which could not be fused by an oxy-hydrogen blowpipe. There were four locks, and there was a trick for every lock. For instance, I saw a lock with a dial, upon which you had to move the finger to thirty-eight, and then push it back four spaces before the key could be turned. Inside the safe there were four chronometer clocks, which could be set like an alarm clock, for any hour. If, for example, they

were set at nine o'clock to-morrow morning—and one of them would be sure to go until that hour—even if you knew the tricks of the four locks, the four keys would not be the least good; you could not open the door of the safe until that hour to-morrow morning. Further, if burglars made an attempt to destroy the locks with high explosive, the explosion would release steel bars which would refix the door. Amazing ingenuity! That door stands for the barrier which must be erected between the thief and the honest man. It is a symbol of the armies and navies which must be maintained between nations that have different levels of morality. It is of supreme importance that the nations should be lifted on to one high level of morality, and that they should have power to reach it. The nations need the vision of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of law, and Jesus Christ is Himself the Gospel. He has said, "I, if I"—thank God, it is the only "if"—"be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself." I sometimes hear good men say, "How hard it is to compete with the picture palace and other attractions of these days." Not a bit of it.

Jesus Christ has no rival, and if we hold up Jesus Christ we have nothing to fear. He is the fulfilment of law, and He is Himself the Gospel.

God has two supernatural instruments for lifting up Jesus Christ—the living Church and the Bible. The Church is the elder witness of the two, but the Church goes astray when it neglects the Bible. Read history and there is no doubt about that statement. The Church and the Bible must go together—two witnesses with one single purpose—to lift up the living Christ, the fulfilment of law, and Himself the Gospel. He is the centre of gravity. External organisations, sacraments Divinely sanctioned, systems of theology, dogmatic definitions—these things are important, but they are only means, and God forbid that we should go on quarrelling and splitting over the means. They are not the end. Christ said, "Come unto Me." In Him is the law, the Gospel, the power that can help the Regions Beyond.

Thank God, the Christian Church is doing a great deal. Read the missionary survey of the world for the year 1922 in the *International Review of Missions* for last April, and it will

encourage you amazingly. We are not getting worse; the world is making headway. The kingdom of God is coming, but it will come a great deal faster if we Christians stand side by side and stop quarrelling. The Regions Beyond are in sin. In their sorrow and strife they are calling for help, but they do not know what they need to help them most. We know what they need, and we know that the call within us to "Go and teach all nations" is from God. What ought the response of the Home Church to be? I feel that no one can answer that question to such purpose as those who are giving themselves to the Mission Field.

III. THE RESPONSE OF THE HOME BASE

By the Rt. Rev. The Bishop of Uganda

THE theme committed to me is, The Response of the Home Church, or the Home Base, to the Appeal from Abroad. I want to suggest four propositions for our thought. The first is this : That *unity is vital to success in the Mission Field.* Unity is vital to success. First of all—I speak from the point of view of the African missionary—it is vital that we should put the Gospel message to the African in an intelligible way, and in the simplest possible way. As we all know, the African mind is the mind of a child—in many cases, as in Uganda, of an extraordinarily intelligent child, but the mind of a child; wonderfully well informed within his own little circle, but it is a small circle, and his mind has never been trained to deep thinking. If you are going to bring into that little circle of his mind an intelligible Gospel, it must be put in the simplest, clearest possible way. If

you have at the same moment that Gospel, which in itself is a difficult thing to explain to a raw native, put by three or four competing Missions in different ways, you will leave his mind hopelessly confused; and the result again and again is this: the man who might have been a convert remains a heathen, as in the case of Mutesa, a former king of Uganda, who pleaded as an excuse that he could never tell which to believe. I have seen myself, within the circle of a few miles, a Roman Catholic Mission, a Church of England Mission, an Independent Mission, a Quaker Mission, and a Seventh-day Adventist Mission. An immature Christian, who has been welcomed as a member, and accustomed to communicate in one church—goes to another Mission and finds himself in the midst of a Christian company from which he is ostracised. Therefore, I say, for the sake of the native it is vital that we should take to heart our divisions. I have felt that for years, and I feel it more strongly the more I see of the conditions in the Mission Field. It is pitiable, not only the overlapping, but the sheer waste of missionary resources. I have seen a powerful Mission which could have

evangelised a large area, with a very complete staff for educational and medical work and the like; and five miles off there is a Mission belonging to another Society, and twelve miles away another Society. They are cramped and confined when they could do a much greater work. We cannot afford, in the Mission Field, at any rate, to divide as we have been divided.

Then, I think, saddest of all, there is not only confusion in the native mind, and not only waste of missionary resources, which are small enough—but we are sowing the seeds of future discord. Remember, every Church at home is reproducing a Mission abroad, and every Mission in turn is reproduced in a native Church sooner or later, and our differences are transplanted and brought into that virgin soil, where, as we have just been reminded, they do not ask for them, they do not want them. They want the message of the Gospel, and they do not want to be confused. I need not labour this. That is the first proposition that I lay before you—that unity is essential to success in the Mission Field.

I will just add, before I leave that point, that we in Uganda have been extraordinarily

favourably situated in having a clear field. Apart from the Roman Catholic Mission or Missions, there is no other Mission, except in one far corner, 250 or more miles away from the capital. The whole field has been left to the C.M.S. I have always felt that it is very highly to the credit of other Missionary Societies that they should have left such a fertile field as Uganda to that one Society. The result has been that that one country has been covered with a network of two thousand native churches, and a great native Church is being built up there which is not divided.

The second proposition that I want to lay before you is this : *Unity in the Mission Field is impossible without unity at home.* We have often been told, and it is perfectly true, that the Mission Field will lead the way in the direction of unity. I think the Mission Field has led the way, *is* leading the way, in the direction of unity. In every part of the world—in India, and China and elsewhere—you find that Missions are trying to get together. They go, step by step, up to a certain point beyond which they cannot go. I have seen it in action in East Africa, from the very beginning, when we met in a little, tiny local

conference at a place on the Victoria Lake. I have seen it growing to larger dimensions when we met at Kikuyu, in 1913, and again in 1918, until we came up to a certain point, when we passed this resolution: That we should never rest until all could share one ministry. Then we had to turn back to the Churches at home and say, "It is for you to devise means by which this can be made possible." We have come up against the real difficulty that we cannot go beyond a certain point, and we ought not to go beyond a certain point, independently of the home Churches. The Mission in the field is a part of the Church at home, and has no right to take an altogether independent line; but as it occupies a post in the field it does turn back and say, "Do make it possible to avoid this evil of confusing the native mind, and sowing discord where it ought not to be." For discord at home can wreck unity in the Mission Field.

Most of us will remember well the difficulty that we had to face in 1914, in what was called the Kikuyu Controversy. There were at that time four leading Societies working in East Africa, and those four Societies eventually,

as the result of a conference, came together and formed what was called a Missionary Alliance. Only a few months ago, before I left to come home, I had news that the largest of those Societies in the field was withdrawing from the Alliance on account of an unhappy, and most unfortunate, and to my mind most unnecessary, controversy at home. So discord at home is thrown like a bomb into the Mission Field, and wrecks the attempt there of getting together. Not only can we not go beyond a certain point, but when we have reached that point we are drawn back because of divisions at home. That is the second point I want to leave with you—that unity in the Mission Field is impossible without unity at home.

The third proposition—I hesitate as to whether it ought not to be put in the form of a question rather than a proposition—is, that *unity at home is possible.* I say it is possible, first of all, because Jesus Christ deliberately prayed for it. We cannot believe that He prayed for a thing which was in the nature of the case an impossibility. It is a thing that actually was achieved in the early days of Christianity. The Apostles realised that the

Church was one, as a building or as a body is one. I say it is possible because, the world over, there is a great feeling out towards it, an intense desire that it should be. I say it is possible because every time that a little body of men who differ get together, and have time enough to do it, and meet in the right spirit, they come appreciably nearer to one another. It is when we sit in our different camps and put up our barriers, and sit behind these barriers, that we find it impossible to come together. But when we have come together in conference and prayer, we find that the barriers are not so great and insuperable as we had feared.

But what do we mean exactly by unity? I want to try to face that question. What is really possible? And what is not possible? First of all, it is not possible to have any real fellowship without a common life in Christ. But it ought to be possible, and it is possible, to have a real fellowship with all those who "love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." There is your circle, within which fellowship is possible; outside which you may have an organised relationship and even organic union, but no real fellowship. But within that

circle, of those devoted to the one Lord, there is and there should be fellowship. Whether a man be a Roman Catholic, or an Anglican, or a member of a Greek Church, or a Baptist, or whatever he may be, when you meet within that circle you shake hands as brethren, and realise that there is a profound unity between you already.

Secondly, it is absolutely impossible that we should all think alike. We were reminded of that this morning—that if we did think alike it would only be because we were not thinking at all. The more we think and read the more must we find divergence of thought. We do differ. But I do believe that it is possible to differ from anyone, and to differ widely and feel strongly, and yet to understand and love that man. When you are meeting on that one ground, within that circle, in a common devotion to Jesus Christ, when you are really trying to understand that man's position and giving him credit for honesty—when in your heart you have got that fellowship established, you can meet with him and draw near to him.

Thirdly, it is impossible to ignore our differences and to go on as if they did not

exist. Happily there is a great deal of common ground. For example, the one to whom we have just been listening this evening stands out as one of the great representatives of one common ground on which we can all join hands—the Bible Society. But there is also a great deal of debatable ground. It is easy to be in a broad-minded way tolerant of everything, if you have no deep convictions. It is the men who feel strongly, and the women who feel strongly, and yet can be tolerant and understand another's position, and appreciate it—these are the men and women who are making for unity. We do not want merely polite phrases to smooth over our differences.

I found, in all our long series of discussions in East Africa, that it paid emphatically to speak perfectly frankly—not merely in a pleasant, friendly interchange of compliments; we spoke about our differences, and we got down as it were to bedrock. If you can do that in the spirit of Christian love, you will find that you get very near together.

I want to say one thing with which I am quite sure many here will not at once agree. But I think it ought to be said. It is im-

possible to come quickly and easily to terms with all classes of Christian men and women. There are some who are naturally drawn in one direction, and some in another. But I do feel that Christian unity does demand that all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity should love one another. I do not mean to say that we Evangelicals should love only Evangelicals and put up a strong barrier against Roman Catholics, and Anglo-Catholics, and members of the Greek Church, and so get one section reaching out in that direction, and another in this. But if we can only climb high enough, where Jesus Christ Himself is, in the "heavenly places," we shall realise that those whom He receives we must receive, that those whom He honours we can honour, that those whom He loves we can love. And we shall never get beyond that.

I would say this with regard to the possibility of union. I am quite sure that there is only one centre round which union will ever be possible. It has been sought in a great many ways. It was hoped at one time that the Papacy would unite the whole of Christendom, and externally it did for a long time unite a great part of it, though the Greek

Church remained outside. It has been hoped that the united Episcopate would form a centre around which everything could gather. It has been believed that a Creed could unite all Christians together; that belief in the Bible should act as a unifying centre. But there is only one centre, and that is, Jesus Christ Himself. The nearer we come to the Centre the nearer we shall always come to one another. "In Him each several building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." That is my third proposition, and I want to leave it rather as a matter for thought than as a dogmatic statement—that reunion is possible.

The fourth follows simply and naturally—I will not say more than a few words about it—that *unity in the Home Church would have an incalculable effect on the Mission Field.* Just in imagination try to think what it would be if the Christian Church at home really could come together in one body. What a magnificent appeal it would make to the world—not the world in the Mission Field only, but to the world as a whole. There would be a thrill of inspiration in all our work abroad, if we could feel that behind us stood

not a divided Christendom, but a solid phalanx of those who are one in Jesus Christ.

I close with one illustration which has often appealed to myself personally, and which I think makes the matter very clear. Imagine at the base of some great mountain in Switzerland two villages, each village surrounded by its own little hills, and separated from one another by these hills. Above them towers a great mountain height. One day there comes from one of these villages an Alpine climber who finds his way up into that great height, and from there looks down into the deep valleys below, and there sees his own little village. Lying close to it he sees another little village. As he sits there he is conscious of another climber sitting by his side, looking out on the same view, and breathing the same air. This other man has come from the other village. There the two sit together and compare notes as to how they came. You will find in the Epistle to the Ephesians an alternation between "we" and "you." You will find that "we" represents the Jewish Christian speaking, and he describes how he has come out of the shadow of death, and how he has risen in Christ along that narrow path-

way, and is made to sit in "heavenly places." "And *you also*," the Gentile Christian, "have come by the same road through the grace of God from your village,"—and he describes it in all its depth of darkness—"up that same path." What St. Paul said of the Jew and Gentile, may we not say to-day of Churchman and Nonconformist, of black and white, and all races who have come by that one path out of darkness into that clear sunlight? The more we can dwell in "heavenly places in Christ Jesus," where we ought to be, the more those differences that to-day separate us will tend to disappear. May God by His Holy Spirit unite in one body all who love Him in sincerity.

"UNUM CORPUS SUMUS IN CHRISTO."

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE

(BRITISH ORGANISATION),

19 Russell Square, London, W.C.1

THE World's Evangelical Alliance had its origin in a spontaneous and widespread desire on the part of Evangelical Christian people in different Churches and Countries for a visible Association which might manifest and promote Christian Unity and Co-operation.

At a remarkable Conference of 800 Christians in Freemasons' Hall, London, August 1846, the Alliance had its birth. The meeting was composed of members of the Church of England, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Moravians and others, and included many distinguished divines and philanthropists from the United States of America, France, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries, as well as from the United Kingdom.

The Basis of the Alliance is comprehensive of the common faith of all true Christians from the beginning. If emphasis is laid upon one part of that faith more than another it is upon the "Divine Inspiration, Authority, and Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures"; the proper Deity, Humanity, and Atoning work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the one Source of Salvation and the centre of all true Christian Union and Fellowship; and the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.

1. Union of Protestant Churches and Christians

Branches of the Alliance were quickly formed throughout Evangelical Christendom and even among the missionaries of Turkey, India, Japan, etc. These have now spread and have

become a powerful influence in present-day aspirations towards Christian Unity.

Representatives exist in one hundred countries of the world. Some of the most practical work of the Alliance has been in the Mission Field, where the healing of differences between Christian workers has resulted in definite spiritual revival and the salvation of souls.

International Conferences have been held in the great capitals of the Christian world, and while they resemble the Œcumenical Councils of the Romish or Greek Church in their widespread influence, they differ from them in having neither disciplinary nor legislative rights, but only moral and spiritual power.

At these Conferences Christians from all countries, speaking many languages, are brought together for united worship, for brotherly intercourse and for free discussion. They have proved that freedom of conscience and Christian Union are not merely not antagonistic, but essential to each other; that freedom is the basis of union, and union the result and support of freedom.

Each of these eleven International Conferences has been, moreover, of a special Missionary character, drawing together Missionary forces from all parts of the world. The printed programme of each Conference has had one section devoted to World-Missionary effort, while one day of the Universal Week of Prayer is annually devoted to Foreign Missions.

2. Religious Liberty, Relief of Persecuted Christians, etc.

As these sacred words are capable of misuse and perversion, we wish to say that we use them in their fullest and most restricted sense in which they are understood in Protestant countries, especially in Great Britain and America. Freedom of conscience as distinguished from mere toleration is the birthright of every man, and with it goes that freedom of worship which it is the duty of Governments to protect.

The Alliance was the first organisation in the world formed to aid those who are persecuted for the faith of Christ. It has

accomplished much, more than can be told here, in Spain, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy, Korea, Transylvania, Sweden, Russia, and other countries, and some of its most important work for religious liberty has been done in Mohammedan or heathen lands.

Beyond its widespread influence at home the Alliance is privileged to come to the aid of Churches and Christians witnessing for the Evangelical Faith in lands where such are often oppressed and menaced. In some lands the intolerance of Roman Catholicism can only be met by practical aid to threatened causes and peoples, by the support of special Agents, as in Malta, Russia, etc., and by the alert and immediate intervention of a central Society in the interests of Religious Liberty. In other lands the devastation of War has destroyed resources in centres of Evangelical work where adherents look to the Alliance for sympathy and aid in re-establishing their witness. In Russia and other parts of the Near and Far East there are Christians in bitter suffering, many of them known and honoured leaders in Christian service. It is to the Alliance that these turn for sympathy and succour. Service of this order is usually too delicate and personal to be tabulated in a Report, but it is a needful and manifest Christian duty.

In every mission land with a recognised and responsible Government the Alliance has come to be looked upon as a court of appeal for Religious Liberty and for those oppressed for Christ's sake. Its unsectarian spirit, its freedom from all political trammels, and its world-wide ramifications, qualify and entitle it to make petition or protest to any Government in the world, and have always secured it a respectful hearing.

3. The Universal Week of Prayer

Not the least important of the operations of the Alliance is the organisation of the Week of Prayer, commencing with the first Lord's Day of each year. While such a week was observed in London and other British centres from the first inception of the Alliance, its development into a concert of prayer by Christians in different lands was due to the English and American missionaries at Ludhiana, India, who urged this extension of the original scheme. This was in 1859, and the Missionary Conference held in Liverpool in 1860, having considered a proposal for the setting apart of special prayer for Missions at the

commencement of 1861, expressed their earnest hope that such a plan might be carried into effect. One of the Ludhiana Missionaries, the Rev. Mr. Morrison, then addressed a letter to the Alliance proposing that their call to prayer should now be addressed to Christians in every part of the world. Thus, happily, at the instance of missionaries was inaugurated that Week of Prayer which has become Universal.

The annual invitation to observe the first complete week of the new year in this way bears the signatures of well-known men in many lands and is responded to by Christians all over the world. It is particularly gratifying to note that the whole of the Protestant Missionary Societies, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, and other inter-denominational organisations cordially co-operate with the Evangelical Alliance each year in circulating the programme of Prayer for the week throughout the Mission fields of the world.

The Alliance pays annually for the translation of its Programme of Prayer into various languages and dialects, and for its circulation to Mission stations in many lands.

4. Missionary and Evangelistic Work

In addition to practical work, Devotional, Missionary and Philanthropic, the Alliance is engaged in various enterprises of direct Gospel work at home and abroad. Its Evangelical and Missionary character, its world-wide interests and influence and its comprehensive platform supply an approved agency through which the preaching of the Gospel of Christ is being effectively promoted. The Christian Union and Co-operation which the Alliance represents is the most urgent need of the present time, and the Council appeal to Christians of all Churches, ladies as well as gentlemen, to join the Membership of the Alliance, or to become Subscribers.

Those willing to join the Membership of the Alliance or to become Subscribers are asked kindly to address

THE GENERAL SECRETARY,
World's Evangelical Alliance,
19 Russell Square, London, W.C. 1

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Nov. 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 145 982 5